DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 115 LI 003 860

TITLE	The University Library in the Seventies, Minutes of the Seventy-Eighth Meeting, (Colorado Springs, Colorado, May 14 - 15, 1971).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	122p.; (4 References)
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Information Services; Library Associations; *Library Cooperation; *Library Planning; Meetings; *Research Libraries; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Association of Research Libraries

ABSTRACT

The program portion of this meeting focuses on an environmental approach to research libraries in this decade. The first two speakers are concerned with the immediate surroundings of the university research library. The next two speakers address themselves to the environments outside the university to which the library must relate. The last speaker presents an international view of the meeting's theme. The first day's program concludes with a panel discussion, "Collective Action by Research Libraries: Problems and Potential." The second day of the meeting was composed of concurrent discussion groups. Summaries of four of the five discussions held appear as appendices to these minutes. (Author/NH)

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1 9 7 1

John McDonald, University of Connecticut - President
Warren Haas, Columbia University - Past President

Robert Blackburn, University of Toronto (Jan. 1973)
Ben Bowman, University of Rochester (Jan. 1974)
William Budington, John Crerar (Jan. 1973)
David Kaser, Cornell University (Jan. 1972)
Arthur McAnally, University of Oklahoma (Jan. 1974)
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, University of British Columbia (Jan. 1973)
Robert Vosper, University of California, L.A. (Jan. 1972)
David Weber, Stanford University (Jan. 1974)

STAFF

Stephen McCarthy .....Executive Director

Louis Martin .....Associate Executive Director

E. Alex Baer.....Director, Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center

Duane Webster.....Director, Office of University Library Management Studies

P. K. Yu.....Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials

The office of the Association of Research Libraries is located at 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-2466.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 067115

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY IN THE SEVENTIES

Minutes of the Seventy-Eighth Meeting

May 14 - 15, 1971
Colorado Springs, Colorado

LI 003 860

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	v
Opening	1
The University Library in the Seventies:	
Introduction -- Thomas Buckman	2
"New Trends in Higher Education: The Impact on the University Library" -- Richard Lyman	3
"Response of University Library Management to Changing Modes of University Governance and Control" -- Earl Bolton	11
Discussion	18
"The Information Industry and the Research Library Community" -- Paul Zurkowski	24
"Information Services of the Federal Government" -- Melvin Day	32
Discussion	35
"The Western European University and Research Library in the Next Decade" -- Herman Liebaers	40
Discussion	48
Collective Action by Research Libraries: Problems and Potential:	
Introduction -- John McDonald	50
"Coordinating Library Development in New York" -- Myles Slatin	52
"Research Libraries in Concert: The CRL" -- Lewis Branscomb	56
"MARLIN, and Some General Comments On Library Cooperation" -- John Berthel	60
"The Periodical Resources Center: A Lovely Unicorn" -- Joseph Jeffs	64
Business Meeting	
Report of the Membership Committee	70
Report on Proposed New Committee Structure for the ARL	80
Associate Executive Director's Report	83
President's Report	84
Appendixes	
A. Summary of Discussion of the ARL Management Studies Program: Objectives, Procedures and Products	86
B. Summary of Discussion of Staff Development in Research Libraries	89
C. Summary of Discussion of the ARL Interlibrary Loan Study and of Library Networks	90
D. Summary of Discussion of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging	92
E. Draft Report of the ARL Membership Committee	94

CONTENTS

		Page
F.	Draft Report on a New Committee Structure for the Association of Research Libraries	98
G.	Report of the ARL Committee on Non-GPO Publications	103
H.	Committees of the Association of Research Libraries	106
I.	Attendance at 78th Meeting	110
J.	Membership of the Association of Research Libraries	115

PREFACE

The Seventy-eighth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries departed from past practice in several respects. First, it was moved to a new time, the month of May. Formerly, the second meeting of the year was held in conjunction with the meeting of the American Library Association, which takes place in late June. The new date removed schedule conflicts for those representatives of the ARL who also had responsibilities to the ALA.

Secondly, the meeting was scheduled for two days, rather than for one. The added time allowed more papers on topics of importance to the Association. Through the use of concurrent discussion groups on the second day of the meeting, the membership was able to focus on the status of current projects and to hear and comment on proposals for future action. (Summaries of four of the five discussions held appear as appendixes to these Minutes.)

Finally, the meeting was organized around a central theme, "The University Library in the Seventies." The speakers, the discussion groups, and even the business portion of the meeting spoke to the changing landscape of the information environment and the tools necessary to assure rational growth and development of resources and services.

The success of this meeting was due in large part to the work of the Program Committee: Thomas Buckman, chairman, John McDonald and Warren Haas. Mr. Buckman especially is to be commended for his foresight and diligence. He developed and administered a questionnaire to the membership which led to the format and content of the Seventy-eighth Meeting. He also was largely responsible for the myriad details involved in organizing the whole proceeding.

THE EDITOR

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 78th Meeting

-

Thomas R. Buckman, presiding

-

The Seventy-eighth meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Broadmoor Hotel in Colorado Springs, Colorado, on May 14-15, 1971.

President Thomas R. Buckman opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing representatives of new ARL member libraries, new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

After Louis Martin explained the meeting procedures which would be followed during the two-day meeting, Mr. Buckman began the program by explaining its theme, "The University Library in the Seventies."

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY IN THE SEVENTIES

Introduction

Mr. Buckman: The program portion of this meeting focuses on an enviromental approach to research libraries in this decade. It has seemed to many of us that research libraries are entering a new landscape containing unfamiliar scenery. Old and familiar sights are missing, while others have diminished in significance.

Our first two speakers are concerned with the immediate surroundings of the university research library. First, Dr. Richard Lyman will speak to the world of the students and the faculty and comment on the impact of their expectations on the library. Secondly, Mr. Earl Bolton will comment on the changing administrative and physical environments within which the university research library must now exist.

There are other environments outside the university to which the library must relate. These include the publishing and the information industry groups in the commercial sector, and the federal government, whose activities, or lack of them, are matters of vital importance to the higher education community. Mr. Paul Zurkowski and Mr. Melvin Day will address themselves to these two environments.

Early this afternoon, Dr. Herman Liebaers will present us with an international view of our theme, which should provide some interesting comparisons of the U.S. and European scenes. Dr. Liebaers is director of the Royal Library of Belgium and president of the International Federation of Library Associations.

The program for today will conclude with a panel discussion, "Collective Action by Research Libraries: Problems and Potential." John McDonald will moderate the discussion, which will provide insights into that promising, but somewhat unclear, environment of cooperative action.

I should like now to introduce our first speaker, Richard W. Lyman. Dr. Lyman is a historian in the field of comtemporary British history, with a particular interest in the Labor Party. For many years, he has been a special correspondent for the Economist of London. He received his doctorate in history from Harvard in 1954, and from 1958 to 1964 was a member of the faculty at Stanford University. In 1964, he became associate dean of the School of Humanities and Sciences. He was appointed vice president and provost in 1967, acting president of the University in 1970, and in September of that year he became president of Stanford. In recent weeks, he has been particularly close, in fact uncomfortably close, to campus troubles which may be symptomatic of changes that are in store for all of higher education. They certainly are a part of the new environment which we must understand.

Dr. Lyman is also well acquainted with research libraries both as a scholar and as a most valuable member of the Committee on University Library Management, sponsored by the ARL and the American Council on Education.

New Trends in Higher Education: The Impact on the University Library

Dr. Lyman: Doubtless there once was a time in which it was logical to look to a college president for prophecies, at least as far as the future of higher learning and its supporting institutions was concerned. The college or university president had time to think, a suitable vantage point from which to see the world of learning, and a well-stocked and, more important, well-perused library of relevant books and essays.

Habits linger long after the conditions that gave rise to them have disappeared. Nowadays the president's time to think is likely to consist of little more than the hours spent on airplanes (and even that will presumably be eroded once telephones are installed in jets), plus the hours provided by insomnia. His "suitable vantage point from which to see the world of learning" is all too much of the time the academic equivalent of a foxhole, and as for his well-stocked and well-perused library he hasn't time to stock it, much less peruse it. Why should anyone expect wisdom, still less perceptive prophecy, out of a person so beset? Yet you were so incautious as to invite me, and I so rash as to accept. Indeed, I could hardly do otherwise, since I firmly believe that the library is the heart of the university, that a healthy university cannot be without a healthy library--and that not enough university presidents fully and adequately recognize these facts. So here I am.

What can the leaders of research libraries expect as a result of changes in the world of higher education during this decade? Will new groups of library users emerge while others fade from view? What will be the library-related content of higher education, and will it alter in nature or total dimensions? How will society's shifting patterns of life-styles and objectives affect the research libraries? These are the kinds of casual queries put to me by your Program Committee, a group that certainly knows how to seek blood from a turnip. Fortunately, they did not ask me about the effects of technological advances, such as the microfiche revolution, upon higher education. Of the arguments over how soon and how completely these changes will in fact take place, I can only plead ignorance and quote from Richard Brinsley Sheridan's play, The Rivals:

> The quarrel is a very pretty quarrel as it stands; we should only spoil it by trying to explain it.

First, then, the matter of student population. While we are going to arrive at a much-advertised plateau, or even slip into a decline, with respect to the college-age population during the early 1980's, estimates of the U.S. Department of Education call for an increase meanwhile in the number of degree credit students at all levels from the 7 million of 1968 to 10.3 million by 1978.* The percentage increases at all levels and of both

*Statistics of Trends in Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970.

sexes are expected to be smaller than in the previous decade, but that is scant comfort when one looks at the absolute numbers. In persons filing through the library turnstiles or lining up at the checkout counter with books under their arms, the trend is still dramatically upward.

There are voices to be heard questioning such estimates, and asking whether Americans haven't been oversold on the importance of a college education, and whether we aren't even now trying to send to college many persons who would profit more from vocational training, or immediate immersion in the job market.

I doubt that these voices will prevail. We Americans already have demonstrated a capacity for stretching the concept of a college education to include practically every form of skill or knowledge known to man (and perhaps a few that might better have been left unknown). Our ingenuity in this regard seems unlikely to flag. The growth of the community colleges suggests continuing adaptability, although opinions are mixed as to the success of these ventures in meeting the actual needs of their students.

I happen to believe that some of our difficulties derive from our rather undiscriminating notions of what constitutes "higher education"; people's expectations go unfulfilled because of them, and the tendency to reduce the whole thing to a matter of preparing for participation in the economic life of the nation has made us vulnerable to charges of Philistinism--even though some of those making the charge most energetically are themselves Philistines of a rather blatant sort. But the tendency to regard "a college education" as everyone's birthright will grow inexorably, in my opinion.

In all likelihood the educational "stretch-out," whereby even the Ph.D. does not constitute the end of the line and post-doctoral work grows apace, will continue. It may be--one must devoutly hope that it will be--the case that the prospect of still more years of preparation before a person can be considered ready to operate as a fully prepared professional will exert additional pressure upon the contemporary doctorate degree, to shorten its duration and lighten its burdens. Too many doctoral dissertations are still attempts to climb Mt. Everest, when skills that could be acquired by a brisk walk in the foothills are all that the toiler will ever need later in life. Too many dissertation directors feel such a sense of personal identification, not so much with the student as with the student's finished work, that they delay unduly the completion of the doctoral exercise while seeking perfection in the doctoral product.

Yet the total impact of all these shifts inevitably is going to be greater and more diversified demands upon research libraries. You are going to have to provide a greater diversity of services, both because they become technologically possible and because your users are going to be more and more diverse--as to age and ethnic, economic and social background. I believe it is not merely a fashionable cliche to suggest that there will be marked increases in the numbers of people dropping in and out and back into institutions of higher learning. All the signs point that way. "Future shock" cannot be contained otherwise. People's skills will become obsolete and will need refurbishing or replacement. And the increases in leisure time, for practically everybody except research library directors and university presidents, will give people both the opportunity and the motive

to return to the classroom. Further, the drive for women's rights will continue to exert pressure on all institutions, including those once resistant to all thought of part-time study or over-age students.

The relationships between burgeoning state and community colleges and research libraries have yet to be worked out; we all talk about interinstitutional cooperation but its growth is halting and sporadic. The pressure of an increased and diversified student population will make still more imperative the attainment of significant progress along these lines. If progress is made towards something approaching the British "Open University" the major research libraries will have to play their part, too. The combination of these pressures should (to use a hospital analogy) increase the load upon the library's outpatient clinics, as compared to its inpatient wards. The silver lining may conceivably be a greater awareness on the part of the public and the keepers of the public purse that a great research library is not just a piece of a university, but a community asset in its own right, and therefore worthy of community support.

But now I'm poaching in the game preserves of Roman Numerals II and III on your program, the Governmental and Fiscal Environments. Back to the users.

What will all these people be doing in college or the university? How will changes in what they are studying and how they study it affect the libraries? Here again, what I have to offer is largely conventional wisdom. The loosening of the bonds, once provided by curriculum requirements and by compulsory reading assignments within courses, will doubtless continue, at least for a time and in most institutions. I do detect the beginnings of some backlash already, however. At Hampshire College in Massachusetts, while conventional course requirements and majors are eschewed, there is an emphasis on the need for curricular structure and a degree of diversification from each student that seems to me significant. I doubt if most students really want to be quite as free from requirements, and therefore guidance as their rhetoric would cause one to imagine--or as the ablest and most independent-minded of them in fact are.

Still, there will be many, many more flowers growing in the catalog garden; that seems assured. The magic phrase, "interdisciplinary course," has not lost any of its appeal. Indeed, linked as it now is to the belief that subjects hitherto kept apart must be joined together in order to enable us to deal with the problems of our complex world, the password, "interdisciplinary," seems destined for still greater things. To some extent this is bound to feed the publishing trade with new categories of titles, although this is perhaps less likely to affect research libraries than the paperback textbook industry. More important for our purposes, the growth of new combinations of subject matter within courses will connect with the tendency to value independent study, and the research libraries can expect a greater usage from students now veering from the Reserve Book Room to the stacks, and a greater need for cross-referencing, both in bibliographic tools and by skilled reference librarians.

Even without the thrust towards interdisciplinary work, the familiar "knowledge explosion" has been raising the costs of bibliographies, indexes and abstracts to dizzy heights, as you all know. Mr. Ellsworth has said

that the University of Colorado Library now spends more on these items each year than its total acquisition budget fifteen years ago.* And with a greater number of students, possessing a greater variety of backgrounds and of preparedness to use sophisticated research tools, no doubt the costs of staffing will continue to increase, so as to make available to the student the help he needs in making effective use of these bibliographic aids.

It is a commonplace also that greatly increased burdens fall upon the library because of the need to reach beyond the confines of Europe and North America in acquiring research materials. Keeping track of publications of all kinds in portions of the world where neither the publishing industry nor the bibliographic skills and services are well organized becomes terribly difficult. I see little likelihood that such pressures will decrease. We may or may not find ourselves tending towards some form of "neo-isolationism" following our withdrawal from Southeast Asia--as Mr. Nixon says he fears will be the case. But I doubt that such shifts in the emphasis of public concerns will do much to diminish the scholarly interest in all parts of the world that gives rise to these acquisitions burdens. Proverbially, new academic areas are hard to shut down once they have been opened up. As the late dean of Yale College, Bill Devane, once observed: "The trouble with experiments in higher education is that they never fail." We had little or no scholarly competence in the Southeast Asian area before our disastrous political and military involvement there; we have little enough even now. But what we have we'll probably try to hold, and only the sheer rigors of budgetary shortage are likely to make any of us give up.

Since such rigors are having some effect, however, it might be worthwhile to utter a warning note here. If so-called "exotic" programs are eliminated because they are very expensive, and not least so in respect to their library costs, and if the job is done on an individual basis, each institution thinking only of its own programs and assuming that no one else is comtemplating cutting back in the same area of study, the results will be very bad. The same pressures will tend to produce the same results everywhere if there is no effective coordination among institutions. We all agree that there should be greater efforts towards coordination in the building of specialized research collections to avoid expensive overlapping and duplication; I'm now suggesting that there must also be coordination in the dismantling of collections. If Siwash University decides that Balinese studies are too rich for its blood, it had better get in touch with others in the field to make sure that Balinese studies do not simultaneously disappear everywhere in the country. Cooperation in trimming programs could also dovetail with cooperation in building them; the now-to-be-unused publications that comprise Siwash's Balinese collection should go over to Alligator State,

*"ACLS Newsletter," 22 (January, 1971): 10.

whose decision has been to keep its Balinese studies program going, but to cut out Samoan studies, which are being continued at Siwash. And so on.

Much is being said about the need for changes in postgraduate education. If the number of doctoral programs no longer requiring a full-dress dissertation should really increase, one assumes that there would be some lessening of the pressures upon research libraries. But here, as in other matters, it becomes very difficult to distinguish between lip service to a fashionable ideal, and genuine commitment to change. As one of our most experienced college-watchers, Professor Lewis Mayhew, puts it: "There are probably good reasons to wish for a change, but in spite of the fact that 111 institutions /in his 1968-9 survey/ predict a new teaching doctorate/by 1980/, visits to university campuses do not reveal widespread, active interest."* He also notes that despite conflicting opinions as to the need for Ph.D.'s in the coming decade, projects abound for new programs, and not least in those fields most closely dependent upon library resources, the humanities and social behavioral sciences. How the country will respond to the alleged oversupply of Ph.D.'s is perhaps more a function of political attitudes and the resultant availability or unavailability of money than it is of scholarly or institutional choices and ambitions. Depressingly, there are only a few signs of progress towards recognition of the fact that no society can support a full-fledged university at every crossroads, nor even a first rate full-fledged university in every state. State colleges still press for the right to give advanced degrees; universities-in-name-only still strive to become universities-in-fact. Perhaps we shall see, during the next decade, a greater readiness to see merit in a consciously intended and cheerfully accepted diversity of post-secondary educational institutions. Certainly we must hope so, for otherwise we are likely to see more of the tragic and ironic situation in which universities such as Harvard, Stanford and Princeton reduce their graduate programs, while other institutions forge ahead to create new programs despite their lack of research facilities, such as libraries strong enough to support high quality work. As a result, the libraries at Harvard, Stanford and Princeton will not feel any significant reduction of burdens, while new and impossible ones will be placed on the shoulders of library directors elsewhere.

Let me now turn to what one might term the personal and institutional conditions of life, as they are likely to affect research libraries. Presumably the winds of freedom will continue to blow in a bewildering number of directions. More students will elect to live like other citizens, scattered through the surrounding community, rather than in dormitories close to the library doors. More will take part-time work at all levels, while holding a job or raising a family. It is probable that research institutes and "think tanks" not closely connected with any university will

*Graduate & Professional Education, 1980: A Survey of Institutional Plans. New York: 1970, p. 29.

proliferate. Indeed, if the campuses continue to be so frequently disrupted, a great deal of research presently being done in universities may move to less threatened quarters That will be a tragedy, in my view, for it will leave undergraduates with fewer opportunities to learn what research really is (and unlearn some of the popular myths about it), while leaving university research libraries in a most anomalous position, bereft of many of their regular users, but called upon to work out cooperative arrangements from afar with burgeoning institutional users outside the university. Again, although the pattern of use may alter significantly, the burdens of providing service seem likely only to grow, never to decline.

Furthermore it is perhaps worth noting that there are still some fields --one thinks of law immediately--where the dominant research orientation of the post-World-War-II university is only now beginning to take hold. I think you will see the best law schools moving simultaneously towards practical work experiences for their students, and the promotion of more serious advanced research for both students and faculty. Not satisfied with having changed the LL.B. to a J.D. degree, the law schools can be expected to encourage postgraduate work to a significantly greater extent--again, providing only that funding can be found. And if the current crush to gain admission to our law schools continues, and if the current preoccupation on all sides with the enormous needs of our society for trained legal minds persists, even the funding problem may be solved, or at least ameliorated--no doubt to the traumatized surprise of law deans and law librarians who have become accustomed to straitened circumstances while all around them were waxing fat on federal appropriations and foundation largesse.

Against this must be set the perceptible decline in the prestige of research among many younger scholars in the humanities. Even if the teaching doctorate does not materialize to a significant extent, it may well be that the amount and kind of research which graduate students and younger faculty are willing to undertake will change, and in ways that lighten somewhat the strains upon the libraries. This is far too imponderable to judge as yet; one can only note the prevalence of disillusionment with the research mystique, and of attacks upon what the critics consider too literal an attempt to apply to the humanities the styles and traditions of research originally developed by the sciences.

It would be rash to conclude, however, that a diminished respect for traditional kinds of research will make the research librarian's life any easier. For one thing there is the demand for a whole host of nontraditional materials; fewer students may wish to analyze the prosody of Ezra Pound's Cantos, using editions of his works and of works on prosody, but many more will want to listen to tapes or recordings of the cantankerous old poet himself reading from the Cantos. If, as seems likely, more people take seriously the idea of lifelong education, and if, as seem very unlikely, television finally begins to contribute to the cultural life of the country in a way more worthy of its initial promise, thus stimulating the appetites of the general public for knowledge, the libraries will find themselves beset with cries for help from many outside the universities, and will have to respond.

It may be well at this point to recognize another and downright disagreeable result that may come from changing life styles. Heaven knows

that we have already seen instances of brutal disregard for the fragility of a great library, and for the rights of other users. Political protests have in several institutions included vandalism directed at the library, and especially at that precious key to its use, the catalog. At Stanford this year, several thousand catalog entry cards were removed, in many cases defaced or destroyed, as part of a campaign of harassment on behalf of a library employee who had been penalized for his part in a campus disruption. There have been cases of arson in libraries that chill any booklover's heart. And politics aside, the general incidence of theft and careless or outright destructive misuse has become serious cause for concern.

It would be bad enough if one could explain such developments by the fact that many persons are now coming into contact with great libraries for the first time, and are doing so with inadequate preparation to respect their value, or to measure the seriousness of damage done to the collections or the catalogs. Unfortunately, this is almost certainly not the cause of the trouble. Rather it is merely one more expression of that pervasive disrespect for cultural heritage and for the authority of established institutions that infects rich and poor alike, but as far as one can judge seems to take more virulent hold of the rich than of the poor. In all too many cases, the new barbarians do not even have the excuse of an inadequate upbringing.

Less dramatically, but still a problem for anyone trying to manage a library, the strong populist egalitarianism of our time, combined with a love of self-assertion, will make it ever harder to devise effective regulations, especially if the thrust of those regulations is in any way to give greater privileges to some users than to others. As the complexity of services and relationships increases, and likewise the variety of materials collected by libraries, the need to keep track of users might seem greater than ever. But the chances of successfully differentiating among users according to seriousness of need are surely in decline. How could it be otherwise, in a time when some faculty (fortunately not many, as yet) seem unwilling to assert even that they know any more than students, still less that they have any legitimate claims to special attention in the library or anywhere else?

Unhappily, the demand for equal treatment generally takes the form of equal immunity for all, rather than equal subjection to rational regulation for all. It is probably no accident that some of the most egregious faculty scofflaws--the ones who take out hundreds of books and return them never, counting on immunity from fines to shield them--are to be found amongst the ranks of the faculty sympathizers with the newest New Left.

But this paper was not intended to be a political polemic, and I would return to the more general topic with one sweepingly destructive observation. It seems to me that when all of the predicting and the extrapolation of trends is done, we are still left with the stark recognition that a few macro-events entirely outside the world of scholarship can and probably will

make mockery of all efforts to peer ahead. Professor Mayhew* reminds us how suddenly the assassination of Martin Luther King altered the situation with regard to the admission of disadvantaged minority students in all the major universities of the country. Granted, trends were already visible, headed in the same direction; but nothing so dramatic by way of enrollment increases and program innovations would have taken place without this transforming tragedy.

Similarly, the fate of the great issues of our time, from war and peace to the possible invention of breathable air, can produce sudden wrenchings or profound alterations in the course of research libraries. Short of the coming of some new Dark Ages (and how one wishes that some people know enough human history to recognize that as a distinct possibility!), one can be reasonably sure that the future of the libraries will be shaped by the one word, "more." More materials, more users, more services, more relationships to other agencies, more dependence on advanced technology, more need for managerial and diplomatic skills of a very high order--the list is endless. You must be brave people to occupy the positions you now hold; you are not likely to require less courage in the course of the coming decade.

* * * * *

Mr. Buckman: Dr. Lyman's call for "more" leads very nicely into the next topic which Dr. Bolton will speak to. Earl C. Bolton is vice president of the Institutional Management Division of Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc. His major responsibilities are in the areas of higher education and school administration. He received both his A.B. degree and J.D. degree from the University of Southern California; he also holds an LL.B. from the University of San Diego. Prior to joining BAH, Mr. Bolton was vice president for administration at the University of California. In this position he was concerned with contract and grant administration and campus development. He was previously vice president for university relations and vice president for governmental relations at the University. He is presently involved in the ARL management study under way in the Columbia University Libraries.

*Mayhew, op. cit., "Introduction," p. ix.

15

Response of University Library Management to Changing Modes of University Governance and Control

Mr. Bolton: If I were founding a university I would found first a smoking room; then when I had a little more money in hand I would found a dormitory; then after that, or more probably with it, a decent reading room and a library. After that, if I still had more money that I couldn't use, I would hire a professor and get some textbooks.

Stephen Leacock
Oxford As I See It

I begin with this quotation from Stephen Leacock not to deliver some kind of an attention-getting psychic shock to my auditors--(for you will note that Leacock places libraries in the campus pecking order somewhere between the smoking room and textbooks)--but rather to call attention to the fact that in his listing of priorities administrators do not "make the team" at all. This delightful British approach regarding the importance of administrators may exist in our moments of wish-fulfillment on our own campuses, but in fact the top administrators in our institutions of higher education have enormous influence in all aspects of campus life including our libraries.

My remarks are intended to explore changing patterns in campus finance and administration and to investigate the interaction between the central campus administration and the library administration. To do this, I am going to have to engage in one of mankind's most hazardous activities--predicting the future. I am willing to undertake this foolhardy enterprise because of the courageous example set by those who selected the theme for this conference, "The University Library in the Seventies," and assigned the many anticipatory and prospective subjects which we will be discussing today and tomorrow.

For nearly thirty years as student, graduate student, faculty member and administrator, I have been attending various academic meetings, conferences and conventions. As we all know, these often are centered around the status quo, some recently concluded project of interest, the history of some worthwhile effort or the whipping of a dead horse. Although it is indeed much safer to whip a dead horse than to try to tame a live one, I heartily commend those who assigned to this conference a forward-looking orientation and hope that, by the time we go our separate ways Sunday, we all have some slightly better insights into how to deal with what may turn out to be the Schizophrenic Seventies.

In reminiscing about the 1960's in higher education in this country, I think it is fair to characterize that decade as a time of:

Great growth and expansion,

Application of confrontational tactics to the campus and to campus issues,

Relative affluence, and

Growing disenchantment in the minds of some donors, legislators, voters and the "general public" (if there is such a thing) regarding the role and operations of colleges and universities.

What will be the main trends on the campuses during the 1970's? If we could meet together here in 1981, what are the labels which we might attribute to this decade? All planning is based on some assumptions about the nature of our future environment, and I suggest that if we continue to speculate throughout this meeting regarding future trends, we will have the best chance of devising effective professional responses for the seventies. As one popular comedian says, "The future lies ahead." So let's take a look at it even though we know at the start that our guesses will be only partially accurate and will need constant readjustment with each passing year.

I suggest that the 1970's will be for higher education a time of:

Financial distress and relatively inadequate funding,

New modes of organization and administration, and

New roles for the library and the librarian.

Let us look at each of these predictions separately and explore their impact upon research libraries and the executives who are responsible for their effective operation.

Financial Distress and Relatively Inadequate Funding

A very melancholy scenario has been repeating itself on our college and university campuses during the last few years. A few months before the end of the fiscal year, the chief fiscal officer goes to the chief executive and says: "It looks as if we're going to have a deficit Mr. President (Chancellor)." The chief administrative officer, of course, asks: "How much?" The chief fiscal officer says, in effect, that he is not sure, that the available data are not adequate for a considered prediction and adds that everything of course will be done to keep the deficit to a minimum. About two months after the close of the fiscal year, the president returns from lunch one day to find his office crowded with several of his colleagues--the chief fiscal officer, the treasurer, the business manager, the budget director, the chief accountant and others. The message is that the deficit was several times that which had been anticipated, and that it looks as if the year just beginning will be even worse.

At this point, the chief executive rapidly reaches several conclusions:

The fiscal reports he had been receiving have not been sufficiently timely or detailed for effective decision-making;

He is going to have to curtail spending dramatically and look for new sources of revenue; and

He had better call up the chairman of the governing board and the chairman of the finance committee immediately because the next board meeting is likely to be quite animated.

As the president looks through the budget to determine where he can make savings, he is more likely than not to come up with one or all of the following questions:

Can't the maintenance we had been planning for the library be deferred?

Can't the library operate with a smaller and less expensive staff?

Can't the acquisition of some of the books and periodicals which the librarian says he needs be postponed until next year?

Why haven't we worked out some kind of a regional arrangement with the other libraries in the area? Whatever became of that idea of central cataloguing? I wonder how much we are losing because of theft from the library each year?

I do not mean to suggest that the chief executive officer is going to single out the library for particularly harsh treatment, but I do mean that the library budget at every institution is always sufficiently large to attract attention, and that the president at least begins with the idea that perhaps there are fewer people with "tenure" and "security of employment" in the library than in many other areas of the university. He will ask himself:

How can I justify continued growth of the library if all other parts of the university are going to have to retrench?

Aren't there too many Ph.D.'s being trained, and didn't I see something that indicates that we will not need to create so many Ph.D's in the future? Therefore, can't we cut back on the materials needed to produce Ph.D.'s?

Shouldn't we charge for some of our services and try to produce supporting income?

I do not profess to have answers to these questions for the president, but I think they are likely to be very much in his mind and, therefore, specifically before us as we talk about the university library in the seventies.

I strongly urge that each of you imagines that your president is wrestling with the foregoing and related questions, and that he has just put his hand on his telephone to call you regarding these issues. Are you prepared

to answer? Would it not be well to list such questions and others you are going to be asked, if you haven't already been asked, and get your closest colleagues to join you in thinking about the most effective replies?

For what it is worth, let me give you a note of encouragement. In the last year as a consultant I have been on more college and university campuses than I had visited during the previous three decades of my association with academia. I have yet to encounter a college president, chief fiscal officer or chairman of a governing board who is planning to solve his fiscal problems at the expense of the library. This is not to say that library budgets will grow as they wish they might, but it is to emphasize that everyone I have talked to is at least giving convincing verbalization to the fact that the library is the basic core upon which the rest of the academic program always depends.

If your chief executives ask you some of the questions outlined above, you may want to remind them of the following theorems:

> Deferred maintenance always leads either to (1) increased costs, (2) reduced scope or (3) decreased quality;
>
> It isn't a fact that every book and publication available today can just as easily and economically be acquired later on; and
>
> If the campus is going to produce a single Ph.D. in a given discipline, the fact that fewer total Ph.D.'s are going to be conferred does not materially reduce library costs.

In the polemics which inevitably surround the process of budget making, there is no way to predict which argument will prove the most convincing or lead to the best results, but it can be averred with absolute certainty that if you neglect to develop the best possible answers to those questions which are put to you by your harassed chief executive, you will not fare as well as you ought to in the division of whatever there is to be divided.

New Modes of Organization and Administration

It does not take an organizational theorist to conclude that in recent years most of the organizations, particularly the major bureaucracies, in our society are in trouble. The structure of our government, our military, our churches, our corporations and our educational institutions do not seem to be able to cope with many of the problems confronting them. One reason is that our organizational patterns and procedures are based on principles of hierarchy and obedience which simply do not work as well in colleges in 1971 as they did in churches in the fifth century. It is a fascinating anomaly that, in an organization made up of highly intellectual and rational men , some of the most archaic procedures and principles of organization are tolerated without question and correction. If you have any doubt as to the primitive nature of academia today, just contemplate--with heartfelt sympathy--the information input overload which your chief executive must endure.

During the 1970's we will see a great change in the structure of and procedures followed in higher education.

> The organization will change from its traditional form to a much more viable and humane structure where lateral interchange is encouraged.
>
> Governing boards will acknowledge and accept their more fundamental policy-making role and leave administration to the administrators.
>
> Decision-making will grow out of a much broader base of consensus and will be much less secretive and arbitrary.
>
> The campus radical and his sympathetic faculty supporter will adopt the posture of relentless gradualism rather than the role of violent disruption.

For more than 300 years, the basic structure of our universities and colleges in this country has remained about the same. The decade of the 1970's is likely to see many experiments and some lasting innovations in how we live together. This decade may witness a breakdown of departmental autonomy and of the artificial divisions we have established in the realm of man's knowledge. Within a few years we may witness the election of our chief executives on some pattern not unlike the British universities. What is wrong with the idea that no university president will be hired for more than a fixed term (say five years) after which his performance will be reviewed, and he might be subject to a reappointment for an additional term if his performance warrants it? I do not really know whether in 1979 our chief executives will be elected by their peers or chosen for a fixed term by the governing board, but I do know that the role of the president or the chancellor has become highly unmanageable, virtually untenable and little of the fun and reward which once existed in this job still remains. Therefore the role of the president (chancellor), the organization of top administration, and many of the procedures which we have lived with in the past are likely to change during this decade.

If I am right and these kinds of changes are imminent, it is imperative that the librarian analyze how he fits into this process of change and where he wants to come out when the dust settles. Here are some ideas we may want to argue about during the question period:

> Should the campus librarian become a university-wide official at the second echelon? Why not establish the position of vice president for university libraries?
>
> Shouldn't the governing board have a standing committee (or subcommittee) on libraries? Or at least shouldn't the board hear a presentation concerning the libraries at least once or twice each academic year?
>
> Should not the university librarian, because of the universal impact his activities have on virtually every aspect of campus life, sit with the highest advisory body to the president?

A fair amount is being written these days about the symptoms, causes and treatment of neurotic organizations. The thesis is that organizations, like individuals, develop neuroses, and unless these matters are treated, the fundamental work for which the organization was originated suffers greatly. My point is that many of our institutions, including universities and colleges, have become neurotic and that pressures will be very great during the 1970's to change their organization and procedures in an attempt to correct these faults and make the institutions more capable of fulfilling their basic roles in modern society. The university librarian should consider this thesis with great care, and if he finds it to have merit he should plan the role he feels he ought to fulfill in a restructured university and work toward achievement of that goal. If the university librarian merely rides the reorganizational hurricane which I am predicting for the seventies, like a shuttlecock in a tempest, he could emerge in a less influential and effective position in the new structure than he holds in the present structure.

New Roles for the Library and the Librarian

Speculations about the proper administrative status of the librarian lead to questions about the role he should play during the seventies. As a starter, let me suggest that the librarian during this decade ought to become very much more of a planner than has traditionally been his inclination.

Planning is the orderly means used by an organization to establish effective control over its own future. As you know, to be effective any plan you devise for the future of your library must be logical, comprehensive, flexible, action-oriented and formal. Further, it must extend into the future and involve human resources. I give this definition and enumerate these elements not only for the record but to stress that it is your responsibility to engage in planning whether anyone else around the campus is doing so or not. During the 1960's, when growth was rampant, optimism was in the air and relative affluence existed, planning hardly seemed necessary (at least very few were seriously undertaking it). When an enterprise is burgeoning, the enthusiasm of growth seems to carry it on toward adequate handling of the challenges ahead. When the fiscal horizons are bleak and retrenchment is indicated, planning is crucial but much more difficult to accomplish. And the more difficult planning becomes, the more important it is for the creative executive to undertake this painful process. Accentuate your role therefore as a planner.

The librarian also should acknowledge his role as a fund raiser. (Are those sighs or groans I hear among you?) I am afraid it is inevitable that, just as surely as the president will single out the library for cost reduction opportunities, he will ask the librarian to assist in raising additional funds. His questions will include the following:

> Can we charge something more for our services?
>
> Can you organize a "friends of the library" or can you somehow stimulate additional memberships for an existing group?

The easiest response for you to make at this juncture is to insist that you are a librarian, not a fund raiser. But I urge you to consider another alternative. Although development officers will loudly proclaim an opposite view, there is nothing mysterious about the art of raising funds, but if you do not personally savor this activity, ask the president for a professional to help you. It is still true that if you provide a professional fund raiser with his administrative costs, 10 percent, 12 percent or 15 percent, or stated otherwise, 10 cents, 12 cents or 15 cents, he can raise for you a dollar. If he is a true professional he will stop asking for additional administrative pump-priming dollars if he concludes that they can't produce new benefactions. Unless you are serving an exceptional institution, your campus is in poor, difficult and, in some cases, dire financial straits. My recommendation is that instead of avoiding the responsibility for fund raising you reach for it and ask for the help you need if fund raising is not among your many skills.

Also become an innovator. Innovation always costs money and, therefore, may seem a little inconsistent with the points I have just made. However, innovation pursued by thoughtful and dedicated executives will increase effectiveness and decrease costs.

It seems clear to me that the current popularity of selfstudy programs, "universities without walls," and expanded adult education will greatly increase the requirements of the library. The tidal wave is coming and several of the subjects in the program of this meeting recognize its imminence. Can you not demonstrate to your president that timely preparation for the inevitable onslaught will prove economical in the end? In short, I am urging that you seize the initiative and point out where future shock is going to hit the library.

This is the decade of Educom, Edunet, communications satellites, facsimile transmission, and burgeoning opportunities for visual outreach. We are close to the time when thousands of students, hundreds of miles apart, will be able to listen to the most distinguished professor in a given field discuss the most recent innovations and his latest thoughts about them. By the end of the 1970's we will surely have data transmission systems which will allow you to call up from a distant place a document needed by one of your users. Too expensive, your president may say, but can we not convince him that the costs of this equipment will be far less than building and maintaining adequate collections in every area your users may require?

Further, the librarian must remain flexible, and here I may be treading upon the thinnest ice yet encountered. I predict that you have on your staff many who are almost too rigid, meticulous and precise. Indeed, these traits may have led them into the orderliness and symmetry of cataloging systems and the joys of collecting and arranging human knowledge. You would not have emerged as a qualified administrator if you had not been able to deal effectively with these tendencies in the staff. But I am urging that even greater flexibility among librarians may be called for in the future. Standing as you are at that point where so many forces converge, it may become necessary to accept many more compromises than have heretofore proved acceptable. You stand at that focus where financial pressures, increased user demands, vast expansion of printed materials and improved techniques of publishers and book salesmen converge. The delays in acquiring, cataloging and shelving a

book may not result from traditional and rigid practices but many administrators and users think so to the detriment of library budgets. A genuine effort by the library staff to evince flexibility and creativity will enhance performance and dispel the idea that libraries are suffering from administrative arthritis.

In summary, the decade of the 1970's will be a time of dramatic change in our fiscal lives, our organizations' structures and procedures and the roles which all of us, including librarians, will be expected to play. To anticipate these changes and reflect on how to meet them is to go far toward solving the problems which are inescapable in the decade ahead.

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing any of us in the seventies is to keep constantly in mind the fundamental mission of the university. We become so caught up in program budgets, structure, procedures, personnel forms, requisitions, labor negotiations and hardware that we are tempted to lose sight of what the institution of higher education is all about. The idea that we are involved in the preservation, transmission, testing, augmentation and application of human knowledge is so exciting that it makes the strains, anxieties and frustrations seem worthwhile.

My remarks have been at times bleak and at times threatening. For my own psychic comfort, I would like to end with two quotations which underscore the importance of the university and of your work. The first is the brief statement of James Bryant Conant taken from his notes on the Harvard tercentenary: "He who enters a university walks on hallowed ground." The second are the words of Thomas Carlyle from his "The Hero as Man of Letters": "The true university of these days is a collection of books."

The 1970's will be difficult and frustrating years, but being a part of a university, you are directly involved with that entity which is likely to provide the best hope for mankind's growth, enrichment and perhaps even his survival; and as both keepers and protectors of a man's knowledge, and as stimulators to its testing and use, you are at the very core of the university community. I wish you continued success in your vastly important undertaking.

* * * * *

Discussion

Mr. Orne (North Carolina): I suggest that there are many librarians who plan actively and extensively and then find themselves operating in a vacuum because the same level of planning does not occur in the university. How do you gentlemen proprose that we improve this situation?

Mr. Bolton: Your point is well taken. It is incredible that only very few universities are doing even elementary planning. I have yet to meet the college president who, however, will admit to not having a plan. There always is a plan. It is some place in his mind, or in the center drawer of his desk, but as for plans that have been carefully developed and have the elements that I indicated there are remarkably few.

Incidentally, Stanford has done a great job of planning its future. In fact, most of the great universities are trying very hard to plan. What I am suggesting is that the librarian in planning as best he can for the 70's, will be doing two things. He will be seeing the road that he must travel as best he can. Of course, every plan must be reviewed periodically; once a year isn't too often. He also will be stimulating the rest of the academic community to do something that it ought to do in any case. Consequently, I'm urging that you keep up your planning and try to make it an infectious virtue which spreads throughout the campus.

Mr. Lyman: Mr. Bolton is too kind. Stanford does not have a plan either.

I want to say two things. First there is a reason for this lack of planning, and it's not a reason to be brushed aside easily. It is that in the history, at least the recent history, of American universities, the creative stimuli and the bright ideas have come from a very decentralized structure and almost have to. I think that the days in which an Elliot or a Lowell built a university are obviously long behind us. The president is not quite as insignificant as he sometimes feels in the planning process, but, nevertheless, he can't by himself generate the kinds of ideas that lead to such innovations as the new, very exciting and very successful, so far, undergraduate program in human biology at Stanford. These ideas come from a group of faculty or staff, who address the central administration and get the needed support. That is typical of the way universities grow. I think excessively centralized planning could stultify real growth.

On the other side, I think librarians suffer because the central administrations have been ineffectual in devising mechanisms whereby the faculties of the schools and the deans could at least keep them posted as to where their thinking is leading them. When a new field of study is opened, we really should know what the library costs are going to be, not just in the first year, but in the tenth year. Further when a program is dropped, we should know the extent of the unneeded information which is in the library. This planning is not easy to do. University presidents can send out a stream of memoranda asking for proper and effective communication, but there is no assurance that the people involved will communicate. This is the point at which the frustrations of the librarians have to be met. As the bits and pieces of plans are developed, there must be a timely and adequate involvement of the librarian.

Mr. Branscomb (Ohio State): Mr. Lyman, do you envision some research activities moving off university campuses because of the possibility of further physical disruption? I should like to know your view in general of the possibility of continued violence on the campuses.

Mr. Lyman: I all try to be brief in my answer because one could talk forever about this subject. I share the widespread wariness of university presidents on this subject. We at Stanford have had the kinds of troubles that we predicted all too accurately at the beginning of the year. I think

universities will continue to face this problem as long as society generally is in the trouble it is in. There is very little cohesiveness; shared assumptions are few; and the level of inhibition is very low. The resulting disruptions affect universities perhaps more acutely than they do most other institutions, because universities can not be so organized as to protect themselves. If they were so organized they would lack the freedom which is the essence of the university.

We are a little more vulnerable at Stanford because we have fourteen ingress roads and where there isn't a road there is an open field. Even the universities, however, in the heart of cities have no really effective way of completely defending themselves.

I don't see any clear change in the underlying causes of the disruption and violence we have seen. If permissiveness is one of the causes, Dr. Spock still lives. If it's the Vietnam war, we are not out of it. If it's tensions among the races, they have a long future as well as a deplorable past, I am afraid.

I think that a good many of the students who took part in uproarious or even violent protest last year but who have not done so this year have simply extended their cynicism. They took part in the first place because they were cynical about the established mechanisms of society as means of achieving progressive change. They now have become cynical about their own alternatives.

However, I don't wish to sound too gloomy. Last spring the leaders of the radical movements were talking about closing down universities even more effectively in 1970-71. Of course, nothing like that has happened.

Mr. Bolton: Since I used the term, "relentless gradualism," and view this matter very much as President Lyman does, I want to add this footnote. It seems to me that those individuals who are trying to bring about basic changes on the campuses are now much taken with the efforts of Salvador Allende in Chile to gain authority and to effect change through established political processes. I think his strategy is being held up as a model by student activists in the hope that it will attract the moderate students. If it does, the groups advocating campus change will grow significantly in numbers.

I admit to being nervous about the next few years. I believe, however, that we have some hope that needed changes will come about without violence or at least with less violence than heretofore. This belief is based on a variety of reasons, one of which is the increasing popularity of consensus management.

Allow me to add a note of levity by reminding you of the cartoon in the New Yorker, which depicted two elderly gentlemen sitting in their posh club. One gentlemen says to the other, "I tell you, when a Communist can come to power through free elections there is something wrong with free elections."

Mr. Rogers (Yale): I should like to ask President Lyman to give his assessment of the likelihood that universities will reduce the number of their instructional and research programs. Many of us feel that such a reduction would be a significant means of reducing demands upon libraries. I should also like to hear his observations of Mr. Bolton's suggestion that head librarians might become university vice presidents.

Mr. Lyman: If I forget the second part of that question I am sure someone will remind me of it.

Narrowing of program offerings is a topic everyone talks about, because in the abstract it appears to be a good idea. Further, such a course is probably a necessity if universities, especially privately supported universities, are going to survive.

One of the few real differences between private institutions, such as Stanford, and publicly supported institutions is that the private universities have less compelling reasons to teach whatever subjects the residents of a state may wish to have taught. On the surface, this distinction would seem to give us a good deal more freedom of action, but actually it does not.

For several years we have had at Stanford a skilled team, including fiscal experts, administrators, faculty members and students working on this problem. Until now they have not come up with anything very significant. We have chipped away at some programs here and there, but as far as totally cutting out programs is concerned the list of accomplishments is very, very short.

One of the reasons for the lack of success in this area is that the predicted savings don't look big enough to justify the trauma that results from eliminating a program. Rules of tenure provide a difficult obstacle, even though most universities have in their tenure policy a statement that a professor can be let go because of an extreme financial emergency. When you get to your lawyers and the head of your local AAUP chapter, however, you find that an overall state of emergency must be declared in order to get rid of advanced study in Slavic linguistics. Otherwise it would be claimed that the fiscal emergency is not severe enough to warrant the recommended action. Given that situation, the real savings would not be very great.

I don't see giving up on this effort, however. Its success depends upon cooperation. If a system can be built in which universities specialize more and help take in each other's washing without feeling threatened, we could go a long way toward solving our problems. Let me give you a small example. A leading foundation encouraged us at Stanford some years ago to emulate the Princeton plan with regard to instruction in some of the more exotic languages. We were to set up a center which would admit students from colleges which cannot offer Chinese and Japanese and provide them with intensive language instruction for one year. They would then return to their colleges. This appeared to be a very rational plan. It would provide students with the chance to study languages not available on their own campuses, and would provide Stanford with students in subjects which ordinarily have too few students to make them economical to teach. The program came to nought because, I think, of fear on the part of the "feeder colleges" that their students might not

return after the year at Stanford. This fear persisted even though Stanford promised that it would not accept transfer applications from students who came to us under this program.

In one way or another, there are many, many difficulties on what seems to be the obvious road to economy. I suppose we are at least going to become a great deal more careful in adding new programs. The suspicion with which I regarded a recent proposal at Stanford to change the name of the Department of German Language and Literature to the Department of German Studies is indicative of this caution. I have statements signed in blood that the new name doesn't mean what it sounds like in terms of future claims on the budget.

Now to that second part of the question relating to vice presidential status for the university librarian. I have difficulty with this concept because my colleagues tell me I am insufficiently sensitive to the importance of titles. Such insensitivity may lead to a failure to recognize the usefulness of a given title for an individual on the one hand, to a commendable restraint in strewing titles around rather thoughtlessly on the other. I don't have strong feelings about the title. It is crucial, however, that the university librarian meet with the highest academic council of the institution, be it a council of deans or another body with similar authority. It would be desirable if the faculty would take the library more to its bosom and introduce the university librarian to the faculty senate in those institutions where one exists. A president can't accomplish this for reasons you know well.

Mr. Boes (Syracuse): Mr. Bolton, you seemed to indicate that the librarian needs to be a stronger manager, at the same time that the university structure is changing to allow more participation in decision making. This participatory process can be seen in the use of selection committees to recommend the appointment of a new librarian. How can this procedure bring about the appointment of a stronger and better manager, since such a person may not be--and often is not--recommended for the job for a variety of reasons, some of which are not relevant?

Mr. Bolton: My hope for the future of the librarian relates not so much to his being a better manager, because I'm not sure that I can explain what a manager is in the limited sense. I am hopeful that librarians will have certain new opportunities on campus. For example, I hope he will have access to the president as a member of his overall advisory planning groups. The role of the librarian as a planner, innovator and as a fund raiser are more important, I think, than that a librarian should be a "tough manager" in the sense of the corporate image fashionable in the 1920's.

What I'm arguing for are different methods of decision making on campus and for expanded and imaginative roles for the librarian.

Mr. Jackson (Pennsylvania State): It seems to me that one of the problems that a librarian faces is that he must relate effectively to the administration on the one hand and to the faculty on the other. Our present situation suggests to me that we librarians have not been effective in "selling" the role of the

library and the librarian to either group. I would like Mr. Lyman and Mr. Bolton to comment on what they see as our most important role.

Mr. Lyman: It seems to me that any problem in role identification or in conveying a certain image to a constituency turns on the question of agreed upon objectives. There is no way to test performance in any situation unless it is tested against either an explicit or an unspoken goal and performance criteria. The answer to any seeming dilemma posed by having a multiple constituency is to have a very precise statement of the purpose and objectives of the library for a specified period of time.

Given purpose, objectives and time frame, the librarian must be positive that he is fulfilling the role which they demand and that he is submitting information to the administration to support the effectiveness of his role. You have raised what is essentially a question of public relations, and the best definition of public relations that I have ever encountered is very simple but very useful: good public relations is excellent performance, publicly appreciated. Without either element, performance or appreciation, there is no public relations.

I should like to urge that the goals of the library be articulated, discussed, and formally accepted. Subsequently, performance must be measured against those accepted goals. Further, there must be a good deal of communication with all of the constituencies of the library which conveys the fact that every effort is being made to achieve the goals agreed upon by the campus community.

Mr. Bolton: My response to Mr. Jackson is in two parts. First, the structure of the university obviously has to be such that the director of libraries can be heard. He must be in a position to speak to people who have the responsibility of actually hearing him out. If this structure is not provided, the librarian is not going to have the kind of influence he needs. The second point I advance with some trepidation. It is that within the limits of the university structure the director of libraries is likely to be listened to in direct proportion to his understanding of the total university, and in proportion to his willingness to step outside the rather narrow role of a provider of a specialized set of services. I submit that no one is going to listen closely to the librarian if he only speaks when there is a direct threat to a library resource or service.

* * * * *

Mr. Buckman: Our next speaker is Paul Zurkowski, executive director of the Information Industry Association. Paul is a lawyer by training, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin Law School in 1957. He has had a variety of legal experience, in private practice with the Interstate Commerce Commission and in the office of the Judge Advocate General for the U. S. Army.

For a number of years he was legislative assistant to Congressman R. W. Kastenmeier. In his present position he represents an association of firms which process and market information. Libraries, of course, are related to the information industry as suppliers, consumers and at times as competitors. The information industry is a relatively new sector of the economy and one which will be of increasing importance in the distribution of information. Research libraries, therefore, must develop a greater awareness of the nature and aims of the industry.

The Information Industry and the Research Library Community

Mr. Zurkowski: I usually am challenged by my board of directors to stop talking in parables. You will see what that means as I go through these remarks. However, when I return, having been here in the shadow of Pikes Peak, I can certainly tell them that I have been to the mountain.

The board of the IIA views my participation in this meeting as a good beginning of what they hope will be a continuing working relationship between members of the industry, research libraries and libraries generally.

Some of the member companies of the IIA have explained why they consider themselves to be in the "information industry." Peter McCullough, president of Xerox Corporation, has set a policy of company growth in the information field in these words.

> The basic purpose of Xerox Corporation is to find the best means to bring greater order and discipline to information. Information is a natural and underdeveloped environment which can be enclosed and made more habitable for the people who live and work within it. Our goal is to define and identify their needs for information and to build structures of information which they find flexible, functional, and effective.

Henry Powell, of Bell and Howell's Micro Photo division, has identified what for him is the common denominator of this industry--information control. For him the function of the industry is to provide man with an ability to get and use the information he needs.

My own favorite way of describing the industry comes out of a news item in the Washington Post for January 3, 1971. The story covered the order of the secretary of defense, Mr. Laird, to destroy all civil disturbance files in Army field intelligence offices. The concluding two paragraphs are a modern Aesop's fable.

> At the Counter-Intelligence Analysis Division in Alexandria, Virginia, the Army took a different approach to the Laird order to destroy files. The information received there for analysis, from both Army and FBI agencies, is stored on microfilm in continuous reels, with millions of pages filed on all sorts of intelligence. The service has decided to destroy the index to the civil disorder information, which is mixed in with everything else.
>
> While the film will still be there, the Army's General Counsel, Jordan, believes it would be all but impossible for anyone to find any specific parts.

Increased printing and storage capabilities and the increased population of information generators are providing the world with an abundance of information materials. Without the means to find and use the specific information required the moment one needs it, having all information is like having no information at all. The information industry is emerging as a supplier of the means to find and use required information.

It should be clear from this general description of the information industry that we and research libraries are part of the same environment. I call it the information service environment. What that environment means can be learned by looking at earlier service environments.

We are in an enviable period today because we can evaluate the means people, at various times in history, have used to satisfy their information requirements. If we look back in time, we can trace the development of the ink-print service environment. This very sophisticated system is composed primarily of three parties: publishers, libraries and schools. Publishers publish and manufacture portable files of information in ink-print formats. Libraries develop collections of these files and schools train people in their use. Each one of these segments is dependent on the other two. They have not always behaved as if they understood this dependency or respected it.

As you know, I became involved in this business through the medium of a Congressman's office. I served for some five years on the personal staff of Congressman Robert Kastenmeier. During that period he was chairman of the Copyright Revision Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and presided over the consideration and passage by the House of the Copyright Revision Bill. It has languished for various reasons in the Senate ever since.

The strongest impression that process left with me was the picture of the deep divisions between the segments of the ink-print service environment. For whatever reason, publishers, libraries and schools, all of whom are served by the Copyright Law, were deeply divided over various provisions of the bill. Although accommodations were achieved, there were many conflicts. Some of these divisions continue today and are responsible, in part, for the languishing of the bill. I personally feel these divisions are a luxury that only a fully matured service environment, such as the ink-print, can afford.

If one looks around today, he will see a variety of wholly different segments of the information service environment: xerographic transmission over telephone wires, the IIA, television, CATV, cassettes, microfilm, information centers, etc.

Librarians must certainly feel a wide range of pressures for change in the way man obtains and uses information. We are working hard to cope with some of these pressures. It is in our response to these pressures that the information industry must accommodate itself to the reality of the research libraries if it is to survive and prosper. Research libraries must do likewise.

Just as a historical note, I'll comment on one other service environment that existed some five hundred years ago. Prior to the introduction of movable type, the manual service environment was essentially maintained by the clergy. The Church derived its power and wealth in large measure from its control of information. It was able to define the real world of its contemporaries in such vivid terms as to be able to sell indulgences for the world hereafter.

With the introduction of movable type, the control the Church exercised was seriously eroded. The turmoil that was loosed on society was as remarkable as the turmoil we are experiencing today. Where Queen Ann sought to use copyright as a method of controlling publishers, we have Mr. Agnew who would use the Federal Communications Act to do the same thing today. Where the Pope had trouble imposing Church doctrine on Henry the VIII, today's establishment has trouble imposing its view of Vietnam, pot or anything else on the younger generation.

My point is that society today is being served by an information service environment that transcends in its complexity anything we have known to date. The implications are staggering, and lest existing institutions such as research libraries be bypassed, or emerging institutions such as the IIA go off down the wrong track, we have to constantly strive to coordinate our efforts and work toward a viable system of satisfying man's information needs.

Furthermore, the information industry, in harnessing computers and other information technology to the profit motive, is causing a classic reversal in the value of information. Whereas power and wealth until now have been generated by advanced access to private stores of information, today the information industry is striving to create power and wealth by selling information. The implications of tying the profit motive to the selective but widespread distribution of information is far-reaching.

For example, in the House of Representatives, there is an institution called the Parliamentarian, who is an employee appointed by the Speaker of the House. He has in his office, behind a black curtain, a looseleaf file of the precedents of the Speaker of the House, dating back to the mid-30's when that document was last printed. He derives his position of power and his income from having his own personal access to that single file. Well, somewhere along the line, somebody is going to figure out how to disseminate that document to members of Congress and we will, for the first time in my lifetime at least, see a parliamentarian on the House floor. One doesn't see it today because there is only one source of information on parliamentary precedents.

Proceeding to my second point, which is that the economics of information are not widely understood or appreciated, I would like to touch on several rules of economics that I have observed from my vantage point in this association.

The first rule is that information in computerized form has many applications. I could cite almost any company on our membership list to demonstrate

this point. The Institute for Scientific Information in Philadelphia, for example, creates its computerized file by committing to computer store the basic data on scientific literature. From that one data file come many products, Current Contents, Science Citation Index, ASCA, Lists of Working Scientists, and many more.

The second rule is that creating files costs several times the original estimates. For those who are considering being fund raisers through the establishment of files, I would suggest they play close attention to this problem. Selling Areas Marketing, Inc. a Time/Life subsidiary, monitors movements of wholesale groceries in twenty-five major food marketing areas in the United States. It also has some 200 girls doing nothing but reading and noting in weekly newspaper advertising average retail food prices, commodity by commodity. SAMI, as it is known, began on the premise that the food business was operated largely on the shirt cuff of the managers, was poorly managed and cost consumers millions of dollars because it lacked necessary information. Proceeding on the assumption that they would be able to generate a file and provide that necessary information, SAMI reportedly spent 3 million dollars creating that file. But when the food wholesaler and grocer were given the information, in coded books the size of the New York yellow pages, they responded by saying, "We are in the food business, not the information business." They rejected the whole system because it wasn't sufficiently "personalized." It did not tell them when and how to do what, commodity by commodity. SAMI had to go back and refine the files, and tailor the end product so that it could be used not only at the management level but at the operating level as well. They had to tell the warehousemen when to stock item A and the grocer when to display item B at or near the cash register. The tab: perhaps another 3 million dollars. But it is working today. The real clue is that people are not trained in the use of information in an organized way. I have learned that red flags should go up when a person proposes to develop an information service because people ought to use information in a certain way. People don't do anything the way they "ought to."

The third rule is that computerized files must be marketed as fully as possible. As a result information services are now provided by a large number of organizations. The manager who sells his industrial board of directors on creating an inhouse information system is faced with the need to amortize its costs as widely as possible. In the case of Dow Chemical in Michigan, this meant offering access to its data files to others. For the First City Bank of New York, it meant marketing access to its file of stock market oriented information.

While flying out here on the plane, I came across an advertisement of the First National City Bank. The very unlikely title was "A Tailor-Made College Selection Service." This bank is offering information services of that kind to its customers. It points out that application fees average about fifteen dollars and that a high school student may apply to as many as ten colleges. The advertisement states, "We think this money should be spent more purposefully. We can help you."

Libraries should be looking for ways to take advantage of this situation by seeking out information suppliers, many of whom will provide educational discounts. Many of them are also faced with the problem that the electric typewriter salesman faced when they tried to introduce electric typewriters. All the offices had manual typewriters and secretaries who were accustomed to using them. They didn't crack that market until they installed the electric typewriters in high school typing classes. The people coming out of those classes ended up with a trained incapacity to use manual typewriters.

I suggest that perhaps without the involvement of libraries in the information industry, people are leaving school with a trained incapacity to use the information technologies that are being used in industry. The industry would like to help libraries accomplish their purposes as well.

There are, of course, some very imaginative and synergistic approaches being developed. McGraw-Hill has published Roark's Handbook of Stresses and Strains for some time. Only recently it entered into a licensing arrangement with United Computing in Kansas City. Rourk's Handbook is a collection of all the mathematical equations an engineer may need in designing a bridge, a house, a tower, or what have you. Many of the equations require hours of laborious calculations.

United Computing offers engineers access to a computer programmed to do these calculations which are based on the equations in the Handbook. McGraw-Hill sells the Handbook to the engineer who then pays McGraw-Hill a royalty for each use. The customer is billed for a very small amount of computer time in lieu of spending a great deal for an engineer's time. In addition to the serendipity involved in this relationship, please note the implications for engineering schools and their curricula and for research libraries should others with intellectual property and computer time for sale work out similar arrangements.

The fourth rule is that individualized information services, like minerals extracted from ore, have greater value. I recently had a rather incredible conversation with a medical doctor who is active as a medical researcher at the National Institutes of Health. It was his contention that because it cost him $400 a year for the journal subscriptions he needs, a personalized information service which would provide him with the 25 percent of the articles in those journals that he really needs should cost him a hundred dollars, or a quarter of the subscription costs. That may be how lunch meat is sold, but creating the system to deliver that kind of personalized imformation is a costly proposition. I suggested that he think more in terms of paying perhaps four times the subscription costs, rather than one-fourth, for this preprocessing service.

A characteristic of the economics of the ink-print service environment has been that books, to be economical to publish, must be addressed to a large audience. This has resulted in a system in which almost everyone has to buy more information than he needs to get the specific information he requires. The publisher has to include in his book or journal materials of interest to a wide variety of individuals. In effect, the publisher has come up with an interest profile for a mass audience, and he includes information of interest to each part of the audience. What the information industry is

trying to do is to reduce this mass profile to an individual interest profile, and to provide the individual with the equivalent of a personalized book or journal.

This, of course, is happening only in stages. Because of the heavy burden excessive quantities of mass profile information impose on individuals, a trade-off is developing. In some cases, the need for specific information is so great from a time standpoint that information files are being searched on demand.

The New York Times, for example, is automating its morgue. With the New York Times Index already in existence, part of the system is in being. The Times, however, is installing a system with some thirty to fourty cathode ray tube display terminals within its own facility in New York City through which its staff can obtain immediate access not only to automated versions of the Index, but to microform copies of the indexed article as well. The Times also is establishing a marketing force to sell this capability to corporate and institutional users on an individual and/or consortium basis. Libraries should be alert to this kind of group rate possibility. In addition, the Times is using the system to create a reprint capability. It plans to provide new publications on a number of subjects for schools and many other institutions. In this respect the Times is offering less than individualized information profile service, yet it is more individualized and tailored to a particular audience than the original product, the daily newspaper.

The economics are rather complex. Certainly the basic creative effort has been made in writing, editing and publishing the daily articles. The index system is funded to serve the reporters of the paper and, thus, only a portion of the sorting out of the articles for reprinting needs to be amortized against any particular reprint product. Yet there is one major cost that is ever present in the information business which is just as real as space, shelving, card files, people behind the reserve desk, etc. That cost is the marketing cost of new information products.

Earl Bassett, of the 3M Company, tells me that 3M uses the following formula in selling information products. Of the one dollar that a customer pays for an information product, thirty-five cents goes to creating the product, and forty cents pays the education and marketing costs required to sell the product. The remaining twenty-five cents of this idealized structure pays taxes and returns a profit to the investors who supported the idea of creating the product in the first place. One might ask, "Why should it cost that much to market information?" The answer is quite simple. Information as a commodity in commerce is without precendent on a mass scale. Certainly, books and journals contain information, but they are sold as books and journals and not as information files. Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review, has publicly lamented the fact that a subscriber to a magazine receives far more than he pays for. When an information company comes along and tries to sell these "information rich" but "information control poor" people the tools by which to organize their information resource it takes a great deal of effort. My point is that these information products require the investment of significant amounts of risk capital.

This brings me around to one relatively new subject of mutual concern to the Association of Research Libraries and to the information industry. It serves as a real test of the theory that we are part of the same service environment and should be able to work out common answers to common problems.

The Public Printer has proposed publishing government documents in microform. This is a complex subject, contrary to some published reports, particularly in the Library Journal. The IIA is not opposed to the micropublishing of government documents by the GPO. We see it, however, as a job that should be done by both government and the private sector, as is now the case. Further, we view with some concern as librarians do the prospect of proliferation of government documents in many formats without any bibliographic controls. We are also concerned that unless the project is approached with some care, the private sector will be eliminated from some areas it is already serving and precluded from entering others.

Our concern also extends to reader acceptability of microforms. The initial proposal made by Mr. Spence, the Public Printer, called for a very producer oriented system. A reduction ratio of 48X was selected because this would allow, in most cases, a one-document equals one-fiche equation. In addition, while the microforms would be distributed free to depository libraries, no resources would be devoted to educating people in the use of microforms or to any of the other efforts required to make information in new formats competitively available in a market system. Indeed, we question whether tax revenues can even be used as risk capital for marketing ventures by the government. Now to a few conclusions.

1. The activities of libraries are going to be increasingly transaction oriented. Libraries will treat users more like customers and will seek to charge for some services.

2. The kinds of services provided library users will change as the products of suppliers of information change.

3. As the suppliers move to more individualized packaging of information, the products they will be making available will increasingly contain both an element of control and a fulfillment capability. This raises the question of whether information centers will compete more directly with libraries.

4. Many suppliers will look to libraries to help train people, who later will be working in industry, in the use of new information products. Libraries, therefore, can look to suppliers for assistance in providing an exposure to these products to students and other users.

5. Libraries cannot expect all of these information materials to come from traditional kinds of suppliers.

6. Finally, although I have made a conscious effort to avoid references to copyright and fair use problems, I'd like to suggest that the question of funding the information chain--the chain of events through which informational materials must go from producers to user--needs complete reevaluation. In a technological information environment, where products are tailored to individual users and copying and transfer technologies are a concomitant of the

product itself, a more realistic way of funding the whole process must be devised. The trend toward transactions in libraries is one clue to the direction in which we must move. Unlike the mature ink-print service environment, I don't think that our information service environment can afford the divisions that have occurred on this subject.

We are partners in the task of serving man's information requirements, and the achievement of a viable way of fulfilling that responsibility in society should be our prime mutual goal.

* * * * *

Mr. Buckman: Melvin S. Day is head of the Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation. He is responsible for executing the Foundation's programs in the field of science information interchange among scientists both within the United States and in foreign countries. Programs include those concerned with publications, translation, indexing and abstracting services, the development of new and improved information systems, and research aimed at improving the application and understanding of basic information processes.

Additionally, he and his staff bear responsibility for effecting coordination among domestic and foreign science information activities and services, and for liaison within the federal government.

Mr. Day joined the National Science Foundation in February 1971. He served with NASA from 1960 where he most recently held the post of deputy assistant administrator. A native of Maine, he was graduated from Bates College in 1943, worked as a chemist and served in the U. S. Army during World War II.

Information Services of the Federal Government

Mr. Day: I want to thank the ARL very much for asking me to participate in this meeting. I do consider it a privilege and an honor. I know many members of the audience personally, and I know all of them by reputation. I do hope that before I return to Washington, I'll get to know all of you just a little bit better, because with your permission I hope to be able to work much more closely with your organization and with you as individuals in the future.

Although, I was initially invited by Mr. Buckman to speak on the relationship of the government's information services to industry and research libraries subsequent conversations with him revealed a more specific interest. After he explained the general topic, he wrote, "Some of us are a little apprehensive that federal information products will not be as freely available to libraries at low cost for the public good as in the past, but rather they may be sold to and through commercial channels." I think this is a point to which we should address ourselves. This morning I shall speak to it.

My remarks will not be tutorial; rather, I hope they will provide some clarification. The truth is that I am very sympathetic to the plight of the libraries. Libraries, as far as I am concerned, have never really enjoyed years of plenty. For libraries, some years have been lean and some years leaner. Right now when budgets are being curtailed and national priorities are being reordered, times are becoming even more lean. Under these circumstances, any action by government agencies that increases costs is good reason for apprehension.

Before proceeding, however, I should stress that in my remarks I will be presenting my own views and interpretations of the circumstances that occasion this concern. I doubt very much that the conditions we are discussing reflect a concerted government policy. Further, there is probably no one person who would be a responsible spokesman for the entire United States Government, except the President or his designated representative.

The formal basis to which the present cost trend has been attributed in other forums in which this problem has been discussed is Circular 825 of the Bureau of the Budget, now called the Office of Management and Budget. Circular 825 provides for user charges. It was revised in October 1963, and this revision addressed itself almost exclusively to procedures of reporting user charges.

Circular 825 was originally issued in September 1959, almost twelve years ago. It revised the revision of a bulletin of the Bureau of the Budget of November 1957. Circular 825 also applies to areas previously covered by another circular issued in January of 1954. So much for the regulatory history.

My reason for pointing up this chronology is to stress the fact that this circular, which has been pointed to as the cause of recent government actions of concern to libraries, is indeed an established federal policy which has not changed materially over the past decade. It states and I quote, "The provisions of this circular cover all federal activities which convey special

benefits to recipients above and beyond those accruant to the public at large."

It is not my intention to enumerate the traditional federal services covered by this circular for which the library community has been accustomed to pay. My main point is that there is nothing new in the policy and its applications. On the other hand, there are numerous instances of federal services and products for which the library community has also paid which are not subsumed by this circular. These activities and services involve arrangements between government and commercial enterprises for services which would be unavailable to the public in the absence of such arrangements.

Agencies of the government have frequently found themselves in a position of having amassed information useful to the public without, however, having the appropriated funds necessary to make this information available. It's regrettable, but unfortunately true. Census monographs and similar products could become available only by virtue of the fact that some commercial enterprise saw value in cooperating with the government to produce them for general distribution and sale.

Another example, perhaps more familiar to librarians, is the comprehensive catalogs published by the Library of Congress in cooperation with non-government organizations, for which libraries have been willing and, I believe, eager to pay, in order to make it possible for the Library of Congress to produce and disseminate these valuable bibliographic products.

Given the fact of increasingly tight appropriations to federal agencies, there is no question that the continuation of traditional services is undergoing reexamination. Some services have or may be discontinued. Others can be continued only through rearrangement of established mechanisms. The funds to do everything that has been done in the past and also to inaugurate new services in response to new demands and requirements are just not available. The government agencies are having some of the same problems that librarians are having with their budgets.

I have discussed with Mr. Sherrod, director of the National Agricultural Library, the problem faced by librarians with respect to the changed pricing and distribution pattern for the Bibliography of Agriculture. He is quite capable of explaining and defending his own actions. I must say, however, that I fully sympathize with his decision even as I appreciate the problem that this decision creates for libraries. If one looks at the larger picture, however, which involves problems of providing for the operation of a large national library and a broad range of services to its patrons, including large research libraries, one recognizes that he did face a very difficult choice. I feel confident that if Mr. Sherrod had continued to produce the Bibliography of Agriculture in its previous mode then other services would have had to be discontinued. Which ones with what other consequences to research libraries? I'm sure that all librarians faced with a money pinch are experiencing the same kind of difficulty. I'm also certain that librarians will reach decisions which satisfy their primary requirements. At least Bibliography is still alive, and of course this may move us to how you feel about that.

The concern of librarians obviously extends beyond this single instance of the Bibliography of Agriculture. Is this a precedent for increased utilization of commercial enterprise by government agencies? I certainly cannot predict the future. There is, however, as I mentioned earlier, ample precedent for just this type of cooperative activity which has been utilized by a number of federal agencies and the Library of Congress as well. Will there be more? I personally think that there will be more. The commercial sector recognizes the growth of the information field and its increasing importance to the nation as a whole. This is not necessarily a bad prospect. Libraries used to do most of their own cataloging and book binding. Today much of this service is procured from commercial enterprises. They would not be in this market if libraries did not benefit by using commercial products.

I can assure you that it is cheaper for some government agencies to contract for production of microform versions of certain information products than for the same agencies to develop inhouse capabilities to achieve the same objective. Under given circumstances of budget arrangements, the choice is either to contract or to eliminate the prospective service. Libraries, as surrogates for their patrons, are in the best position to make cost/benefit judgments which ultimately determine if these services continue or expand or die.

The views I have just expressed also reflect those of the Office of Science Information Service, my office. This posture is not a new one. The legislative mandate, which describes support programs of my office, requires that the office "provide or arrange for the provision of information services to scientists and to support improvements of these services."

In order to ensure that the greatest benefit is derived from federal funds in these support efforts, our policies continue to emphasize support of development, with the understanding that development efforts are time limited and succeeded by new and improved operational capabilities. We also support the fiscal deficits experienced by information services, with a clear and explicit understanding that within prescribed time limits our support must terminate and that the organizations receiving our support will have to become self-sufficient.

The pressure for self-sufficiency has been a strong influence on the information services which have received funding support from the National Science Foundation. It has caused them to examine more carefully the economic environment within which they operate. They must endeavor to recoup the costs of their operations. As costs increase, the choices open to them are limited. They can, first of all, eliminate services which can operate only at a loss. Here I think we all may be losers. They can increase efficiency and reduce unit costs. They can raise the prices charged for services or take other steps that increase the funds designed to provide for operations. In the long run, it seems evident that the pressures that are experienced by agencies of the government and by commercial firms are similar to the pressures that bear upon the traditional academic information services.

Here I would give support to Mr. Bolton's plea for innovation. I would view these pressures as opportunities. The need to reduce costs, one of the aforementioned options, gives rise to innovations. Indeed, it has been most

productive in moving traditional information serivces into computerized modes of operation, thus changing a type of intensive labor activity into one which is machine oriented and can, therefore, benefit from savings introduced by mechanization.

The need to eliminate redundant and/or obsolete services to reduce costs also has occasioned much needed selfstudy and examination of actual as opposed to assumed requirements. This, of course, is always desirable, but it is frequently neglected. The penalty for failing to face up to our management responsibility all too often means higher prices, which in some cases restrains availability of information services and products.

I would like to conclude on an optimistic note, because the situation really isn't all that grim. Given my basic assumptions that we are not dealing with any really new policies, and that government agencies are reacting very properly to stringent fiscal pressures, we must be careful not to over react in a way which hinders new developments or innovations, while continuing established services which have outlived their usefulness.

This cautionary note is particularly important because I do not believe that the present tight budgets will always be with us. At least I hope they won't. We may not soon reach years of plenty, but I do expect some easing of current pressures when our economy recovers and when our national priorities achieve the balance being sought by all of our national leaders. I prefer not to run scared, not to react without considering the long-run implications of decisions that might be reached in response to "scare actions."

We need not argue that the health of research libraries is indispensible to a successful national information network. All of us are committed to this principle. The task ahead, as I see it, is first of all to achieve improved communications among all segments of the information community in order to develop appreciation of our mutual problems, and to develop the necessary solutions using the cooperative means available to us. We share the same problems and working together we can share in their solutions.

* * * * *

Discussion

Mr. Vosper (UCLA): I wonder if I could perhaps propose a little dilemma for our good friend, Mr. Day? All of us can call to mind services which are too important to the public good that their costs are not determined by the market place. Some public control, exerted through various governmental agencies, is used to bring the prices of these services to a point where most people can afford them. On the other hand, some services, the insurance industry for example, are pricing themselves out of the market for many people. Health care has moved in the same direction. Both of these services are not responding effectively to the public interest.

When we discuss the information industry, we are discussing a service which serves the educational needs of the nation, and education is vital to the proper development of the community. It would appear, however, that the information industry may be following in the footsteps of insurance and health care. Some information services already are so expensive that few can afford

them. How can the information industry provide services, clearly in the public interest, at prices that the users of these services can afford?

Mr. Day: I have no ready-made answer to that question. The problem you raise is a serious one and it faces all of us who are involved in helping to determine government policy.

As you know, the Office of Science Information Service is advised by the Science Information Council comprised of experts from the user community, including research libraries. The council reviews our various programs and helps us plan for the future. At present they are studying this problem of information products becoming so expensive that they price themselves out of the market.

One approach to this problem is to provide a governmental subsidy for these products on a continuing basis. My personal response to this approach is negative, because I think that continuing support from the government ultimately means control by the government. Additional government controls are not desirable in the area of information.

As you know, one of the reasons for the continued support by the National Science Foundation of certain information services in a number of disciplines, such as Chemical Abstracts Services, is to enable them to convert to a computerized system to reduce cost. This has produced results. Chemical Abstracts Services has reduced the cost of inputting an item into their system from about $24.00 to approximately $17.00. This reduction has been possible even though CAS is only partially along the road to a fully computerized system. In supporting efforts such as these, the National Science Foundation is concerned primarily with keeping the price of the information at the lowest possible level, while assuring that these vital services remain available.

As I mentioned before, I don't have an answer to Mr. Vosper's question. We in government are grappling with it and we hope we shall receive assistance from the library community. After all, we try to represent the best interests of the user community. To do that we need sound, practical suggestions.

Keep in mind however, that policy in the field of information services is not made solely by the Office of Science Information Service. Our recommendations must be approved by the Office of Science and Technology, the Executive Office, the Office of Management and Budget, not to mention Congress.

Mr. Gosnell (New York University): I should like to continue Mr. Vosper's line of questioning and ask whether it is really in the national interest to have the private sector provide information services formerly provided by the government. Allow me to illustrate my point with a hypothetical example, which really isn't very hypothetical. Assume that a government agency is providing on a regular basis an information service to the library community. This information is provided free of charge. It costs the agency $100,000 a year to compile, arrange, print and distribute it. The agency decides it can no longer afford this activity and arranges to give the information to a publisher who will package and distribute it for a price. If the publisher needs, as Mr. Zurkowski pointed out, 25 cents of each dollar for profit and growth we could have a situation in which the libraries will be paying a total of $300,000 a year, or three times the amount it cost the government agency to fulfill the same function. In this case, it seems to me that it is specious

to argue that the "government has saved $100,000 a year" by turning over this information service to a publisher. The national economy in my view is worse off to the tune of $200,000 per year.

Mr. Day: I am in agreement with your position. Here again, however, we must realize the difficulties which any government agency faces which result from government procedures. Each agency must ask Congress for the funds necessary to do a particular job. Many times these agencies are not given sufficient funds to do some of the things that would be helpful to their constituents, in this case research libraries. In order to stretch the dollars available, decisions will be made to reduce costs in one area in order to expand in other areas. A case in point is the decision by the National Agriculture Library to stop printing and distributing the Bibliography of Agriculture.

In cases such as these, it must be borne in mind that the agency in question is answerable for its activities to the executive branch. If I may cop a plea, and I would like to, one of the larger problems that we in government face in administering and managing information programs is the lack of feedback on those programs from their users. Quite frankly, those of us who are managing information programs have more and more difficulty each year justifying to the Office of Management and Budget their continuation and expansion. One of our problems is the lack of real support from the users. Librarians have the same problem on their campuses. I haven't seen, for example, the science community rise up and demand good information services from the government. We don't hear scientists, as a group, demanding with a voice that can be heard expansion or improvement of services. Most of the changes and improvements in information services and products have come as a result of the actions of the information community, itself, from librarians, for example, who are striving to provide better products and services. As a consequence, those of us operating information programs have difficulty convincing our superiors that these programs aren't good just because we think they are good; they are good primarily because the people who benefit from them think they are good. But the government doesn't hear from those people. As a result, valuable information programs supplied by the government have been dropped.

I probably have not answered your question satisfactorily. The problem you have raised is that it may be cheaper for the government not to provide a certain service. Not providing that service, however, may not be in the best interest of a particular agency or of the users of that service. As you know, we don't have control over the total information activities of the government. If we did, these matters might be handled somewhat differently.

Mr. Zurkowski: I should like to speak to Mr. Gosnell's point. I think Mr. Day got stuck with a question because of my comment on the pricing arrangements in the information market. It should be pointed out that Mr. Bassett was talking about an idealized pricing structure. Actually, he was criticizing the pricing practices of the information industry. He contended that the services and products are vastly underpriced because they are priced according to a formula. An example of that underpricing is a product developed by the Information Handling Services with the help of the Navy Department. This company sells on microfilm an indexed set of military specifications. The price of the product is $3,000 a year. Recently the Navy Department asked

the purchasers of the specifications if they would buy them from the government at a price of $2,400 a year. You will note that the Navy Department offered a reduction of only $600 per year, and yet it has not put any money into the indexing activity or into the marketing of the product. If that is the best the government can do, then information services provided by the private sector certainly are underpriced.

A further problem facing government agencies and other not-for-profit organizations in providing information services is that they are usually limited in their mandates. They may perform only certain information functions. This runs contrary to the economic facts of running an information service. If one is going to have an information service which is economically viable, he must develop as many applications as possible for a given data base. Government and the general not-for-profit sector are inhibited from doing this.

Mr. Eaton (Washington U.): I should like to ask about the problem of quality control of information products produced by private industry. How can we be certain that libraries and other institutions are getting the quality product they are paying for? Must we rely on the market in which theoretically inferior products will be driven out by superior ones? Or is there a role here for monitoring by the government or by a consumer organization to assure quality?

Mr. Zurkowski: That is a difficult question for me to answer. We in the information industry are also concerned about quality control. The Bibliography of Agriculture comes to mind in this regard because it has been converted by the publisher to what we in industry call a "quick and dirty index." There is virtue in this, however, because it provides the company a method of determining how much "cleaner" the indexing system can be. Certainly, the industry is not oblivious to the problem of providing quality products and services.

This question also brings to mind what Sam Walter told me recently. Mr. Walter is the president of a company in Cleveland which markets an information service. He said that he used to become quite concerned when he would attend the meetings of library associations. The librarians would constantly buttonhole him and point out all of the errors in his system. He finally asked them how often they used the system. He found that most of them used it at least three or four times a week. At that point he became less concerned about the problems because if they were really fatal the librarians wouldn't be using his system and, consequently, wouldn't be "bugging" him about how bad the system is. I suspect that the absence of complaints about a product or a system indicates that it is not being used. By no means do I wish to shrug off the question of quality control, but I think from an economic standpoint there has to be some give and take on the part of the producers and users, so that a reasonable balance may be struck between the usability of products and services and the economics needed to sustain them.

Mr. Day: The question of quality control could be addressed to our total competitive system. I think the answer to the question lies in the system, itself. If there is money to be made in the information business there will be lots of competition. If there is lots of competition, we would hope that it would force companies to supply a quality product; otherwise they should go out of business. Competition, of course, is not a perfect answer but it does give some control.

Within information programs supported by the National Science Foundation which work primarily through professional societies, we hope that the membership of the societies will bring about quality control. I think they have done this in the past.

The question you have raised, Mr. Eaton, is a very good one. There is no doubt that the main purpose of a commercial organization is to "make a buck." One way to make a buck is to reduce cost, and it is always a temptation to reduce cost by reducing quality. This is a problem we all recognize but for which there is no perfect answer.

Mr. Heron (Kansas): The constituency of the Information Industry Association consists of both producers and consumers of information. How concerned are you within the industry with rewarding copyright holders for their work?

Mr. Zurkowski: You have correctly identified the dichotomy within the industry. There are individuals in the intelligence evaluation end of the business who feel that they ought to have free access to the published works of other members of the industry. Another group feels that there ought to be some compensation for the use of copyrighted material.

I think there is general recognition that the copyright holder should be reimbursed. The amount of that reimbursement and the method of providing it are not clear. We need a good deal of experimentation on this matter.

* * * * *

Mr. Buckman: We in the United States have a natural historical kinship with the university and research libraries of Western Europe, and a professional interest in such libraries worldwide. We remind ourselves from time to time that library and information problems within our country transcend political divisions. They are, in fact, international in character. For that reason it seemed especially appropriate that a man who represents both the major national library in Western Europe and the international library community, generally, should be on our program.

Dr. Herman Liebaers is director of the Royal Library of Belgium in Brussels, a position he has held since 1956, an associate professor at Brussels University, and, since 1969, president of the International Federation of Library Associations. He has undertaken many study missions throughout the world in the past twenty years, and has published a number of books and many articles on library science, typography, literature and general cultural matters.

His topic suggests to me that we have much to learn from our colleagues overseas, whether they be in Western Europe or elsewhere. Our education begins today with Dr. Liebaers' survey of the similarities of and the differences between our own library problems and those in countries with which we have strong cultural ties. It gives me great pleasure to present Dr. Herman Liebaers, director of the Royal Library of Belguim.

The Western European University and Research Library in the Next Decade

Dr. Liebaers: For quite a number of years I have been wondering why a university in the U.S.A. has been looked upon as an oasis and in Europe as an ivory tower. What is the actual difference? An oasis is a heaven of freedom, an island of well being as contrasted to the surrounding desert, the cultural desert of American society at large, I am supposed to add, I guess; ivory tower translates as an aristocratic attitude towards an environment with pretentions at cultural values but upon which the university looks down with contempt. I guess that in the last decade the oasis as well as the ivory tower has received serious blows from many corners, foremost from the student rebellion which appeared earlier in the U.S. than in Europe, but I imagine that the old continent has made good since, from Rome to Paris, from Berlin to Barcelona. Whatever the challenge of the new generation may be, I am afraid that the obsolete images of oasis and ivory tower will stay with us during the present decade.

These two stylistic expressions will probably remain the background against which universities will develop in the U.S. and Europe in the seventies. It is not easy to try to give a present-day content to these "images de style." I would be tempted to say that the American oasis was, until the recent past, a cultural concept and that today it has social overtones. The old production line--reading, education, progress--has another meaning today within the university environment. The oasis, the Mecca of education, does not necessarily lead to progress. Students and professors jointly question the value of a sophisticated culture when poverty becomes more striking, when the very roots of the American society are exposed in such a way that a friendly foreign observer becomes scared.

The European ivory tower was until recently a self-appraising institution in which social distinction was more important than research competence or scientific expertise. It was not that long ago that an American sociologist wrote an article about medical research in my country under the flowery title "Medicine in a Chateau."

The oasis as the symbol of unorthodoxy in an orthodox society will weaken, and so will the ivory tower as the image of orthodoxy in an unorthodox society. Though both oasis and ivory tower are gradually dwindling away I feel that they still are useful to an explanation of the different approaches in the U.S. and in Europe to the problems of the university and the research library in the seventies.

A European librarian commenting on the American library scene cannot avoid referring to the excellent book by Wilhelm Munthe, American Librarianship from a European Angle, published in 1939 by the A.L.A., and reissued in 1964 by the Shoe String Press. Though not one part of this study can be labeled obsolete, it is incredible how remote is the American library world he observed only three to four decades ago, while his European observation post or, if you prefer, the philosophical background of the European research library, has hardly changed. It is easier to say this here than in London, Berlin, Paris or Oslo, Munthe's home town.

Wilhelm Munthe's wide interest included both public libraries and research libraries. I think that it would be a mistake to ignore public libraries because the observer of today from Europe should not try to escape the difference in the evolution of the relations between the two types of libraries in the U.S. and in Europe. After all, the ARL hardly existed in Munthe's days. It is, however, a difficult assessment, one which I hesitate to make.

The strongest image of American librarianship in Europe in Munthe's time came from the lack of opposition between the public libraries and the research libraries. In Europe this opposition already had taken different shapes, in certain countries sharp ones indeed. I guess that it would be rather close to historical truth to say that American public libraries as a whole were wholeheartedly admired in Europe, while individual American research libraries, such as the older private university libraries or those like the J.P. Morgan Library, the Huntington Library or the Newberry Library, were looked upon with admiration and a certain envy. Incidentally, Munthe, who was the head of a national library which was also a university library, does not mention these three glorious institutions, but he is open to all problems facing American public libraries and American library training, more specifically at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, in his days the new school.

In Munthe's time and since, the Anglo-Saxon--both British and American--concept of the public library has been invading the Northern European continent more and more. The invasion fades gradually away from north to south and from west to east. I do not know why, but the Catholic part of Europe--even when it expresses strong opposition to communist sympathies--is rather impermeable to U.S. public librarianship. But what about university and research libraries?

In 1936, Franklin Roosevelt stated that the library was "the world's largest educational system." Though Munthe quoted this sentence, together with a similar one from Theodore Roosevelt with a more general moral scope, the idea never crossed the Atlantic Ocean. The eminent position of American university libraries within the universities or the independent research library within industrial society has never been reached in Europe, and will not be reached during the present decade, I am sure. Is the opposition between the oasis and the ivory tower lingering? Up to a certain point I think so. The statement, "The better the library, the better the university," has no equivalent in any Western European language, whether it be English, German, French, Italian or Spanish. I am afraid to put Russian into the picture because I am not well enough informed on the position there of the university library within the university.

Though a growing number of European scholars and research librarians have been working since World War I in American universities, I would not say that the American university and library environments--a phrase which Munthe does not use and which probably did not yet exist--have basically influenced the various national environments in Europe, because the fundamental differences from country to country remained the same. The ivory tower idea is still present somewhere in the background. All European universities have

only two points in common: the old self-sufficiency of Herr Professor; and the new self-destroying student unrest. The former tried unsuccessfully to cross the ocean from Germany to the Middle West a century ago; the latter swept successfully from the American West Coast to the East European border some years ago. It is these very differences, from England to the U.S.S.R., from Norway to Portugal, which make comparisons with the monolithic U.S. difficult. I know Americans do not consider the U.S. to be monolithic, but we still do, though probably less than before World War II.

Munthe twice spent a couple of weeks in the U.S. before he was invited as the European expert on American libraries. He was considered as such by nearly all European librarians, with his own acquiescence. During the last twenty years I have been to the U.S. fifteen times and have spent, all in all, about a year here, but I am not considered by others nor do I consider myself an expert on American libraries. Maybe I was one fifteen years ago, but the more I become familiar with American libraries the fewer my certitudes about them. But this is also true when I talk about the British or the German library.

My point is that diversification has been growing in the U.S., while the equating of a national European library system, with a prestigious institution like the British Museum or the Bibliotheque Nationale has been fading away.

One obvious common trend in the U.S. and Europe is the shift of emphasis from the individual institution to collective service. As soon as one has identified this common trend, however, one is tempted to note that it has been interpreted in different ways. As I see it, the relationship between cooperative ventures and individual institutions is still markedly different in the U.S. and Europe. Take for example the American Farmington Plan and the German Sondersammelgebiete. Let me add that today Germany is probably the European country closest to the U.S., the United Kingdom included. The Farmington Plan is an absolutely independent initiative of a series of broad-minded university librarians, while the planning for the Sondersammelgebiete was centrally done in an emerging Federal German Republic. No doubt both plans try to answer the same question, but they are conceived in different ways. That question is, of course, a unifying force. Librarians on both sides of the Atlantic are trying to cope with the steadily growing book production both in the old book producing countries and in countries which lived until recently without books. Even within this common purpose, however, fundamental differences between the U.S. and Europe remain.

If I may stay close to the Farmington Plan and the Sondersammelgebiete, I would like to comment from a European angle on the Shared Cataloging Program. It is undoubtedly the most ambitious professional program for which the initiative has been taken by a federal authority and which is carried out centrally. As such, it goes against the old American liberal tradition and comes closer to a continental European way of tackling problems. After a rather short existence, the Shared Cataloging Program has undoubtedly done a lot to improve bibliographic communication on the international level. When it got started it immediately aroused a great interest outside the U.S. In international circles, such as Unesco, people spoke of universal

bibliographic control, and international organizations, like IFLA, organized meetings to investigate the potential of the Program as an international acquisitions and cataloging tool. The U.S. has generously offered to share the fruits of its labor with the library community at large. Responses to this offer have been extremely different, as is always the case with parochial Europe.

It is not my intention to make an inventory of all these responses, but I would like to note three or four which I happen to know. An indirect product of the Shared Cataloging Program is the use of the MARC format in the British National Bibliography. Great Britain which, for obvious reasons, is always first to react to new American enterprises, was attracted by the prospects of MARC and established a close cooperation which led to a mutually accepted format for the bibliographic description of books in the English language. If I am correctly informed, the tapes produced according to this format are not used to produce Library of Congress cards. This troubles a foreign observer who is convinced that machine-readable catalogs are indispensable to international bibliographic communication.

The reaction in France, as one might have expected, was quite different from the British response. It would be an exaggeration to say that Paris looked upon the Shared Cataloging Program as another example of American imperialism, but something of that kind was certainly present in the mind of my French friends. However the Program has indirectly brought French-speaking librarians to look critically at the bibliographic coverage of books in the French language. The deficiencies of this coverage have been found impressive enough to launch plans for an exhaustive and modern transnational current bibliography of books in French published in France, Canada, Switzerland, Belgium and Africa.

The reaction in Germany was also typical of its open-mindedness towards the U.S. and its sharply critical sense rooted in an old tradition of academic librarianship. The Forschungsgemeinschaft--the federal research council--subsidized a series of investigations to evaluate the Shared Cataloging Program, both as an acquisitions tool and as a cataloging tool. The results of the research relating to acquisitions have been made public, while the research relating to cataloging has not yet been completed.

The first conclusion is rather disappointing. A systematic check of Library of Congress cards by a dozen research libraries has led to the conclusion that they would only acquire an average of 14 percent of the books brought to their attention by the Shared Cataloging Program while important items were acquired by them which escape the Program. Though it is too early to draw conclusions about the Shared Cataloging Program as an international cataloging tool, it seems quite obvious that our German colleagues--and, I would add, most of us--cannot yet ignore the differences in national cataloging traditions which will still, for the coming years, put severe limitations on the efficiency of a worldwide system. Since the Paris Conference, ten years ago, steady progress in internationally accepted cataloging principles could be noted, though the U.S. has not exactly been a leading force in this case. The trend of German thinking seems to lead to national cataloging services aiming at international standardization and machine-readable bibliographic description.

Though the manner in which the German librarians dealt with the Shared Cataloging Program may be termed typically German, the contents of their reactions have a validity all over Europe and will certainly set the tone for future work in this field. Actually, an international seminar on the exchange of magnetic tapes with bibliographic descriptions will be held in a few days in Berlin. The newly founded European League of Research Libraries (LIBER)--aiming to become a continental equivalent of the ARL and working under the auspices of the Council of Europe--has put as one of the first two points on its agenda a European Shared Cataloging Program for its forthcoming meeting next year in June. I have evaluated the Shared Cataloging Program from a non-American point of view. What I wanted to convey to the world outside the U.S. was that feeling of imaginative approach to new problems which I consider to be the main characteristic of American librarianship.

I probably have dwelled too long upon the Shared Cataloging Program but it is, in my opinion, a topic which has two main advantages: it illustrates very well that in the U.S., as well as in Europe, nationwide services, with international implications, take precedence over services of individual institutions; and it lends itself extremely well to a discussion of the similarities of and differences between the U.S. and Europe.

May I come back to the European League of Research Libraries. Since it has the ambition to become a European counterpart of the ARL, I should give some details about this brand new association, which may become, if it is successful, the major bridge between libraries in the U.S. and Europe in the next decade.

The Swiss librarians took the initiative at the Frankfurt meeting of IFLA in 1968. They proposed a study of the possibility of setting up an organization of research libraries in Europe. Two main ideas were behind this proposal: (1) this group of libraries which are closely related and which "speak a common language" could more easily develop a common program than the unwieldy group meeting under IFLA auspices, and (2) the growth in all directions of library responsibility calls for a sharing of the burden.

Parallel to this thinking, the organizers of the new group noted that Europe was less and less central to Unesco's concern, which gives--rightly I would say--almost all its attention to the developing countries. This explains why contact with the Council of Europe has been established, more particularly with the Council's Committee for Cultural Cooperation. The eighteen member states of the Council were invited to send one librarian each to the organizational meeting held just a month ago in Strasburg, France, where the headquarters of the Council are. Most countries, and all the major ones, were present. LIBER has a committee of eight members with a board of five members. The president is J. P. Clavel, university librarian at Lausanne, Switzerland; the two vice-presidents: P. Birkelund, national librarian of Denmark, and Mlle Bossuat, National Library, Paris; the secretary: K. Humphreys, university librarian at Birmingham (for many years secretary of SCONUL); and treasurer: Schmidt-Kunsemuller, university librarian at Kiel, Germany. This information about the structure of LIBER is probably not very exciting, but it may prove useful for future cooperation between the ARL and the European organization.

Besides the European Shared Cataloging Program, LIBER will also organize next year, within the framwork of the International Book Year, a symposium on the behavior of scholars and scientists as library users. This symposium will be held at the University of Bordeaux where Professor Escarpit leads the most active European institute devoted to the sociology of literature and where the material has been collected on which R. Escarpit based his book, The Book Revolution. Though in the past the Institute has given much more attention to the popular book than to the scholarly one, to the reader of the popular rather than to the scholarly library user, it was felt that it was the best harbor for the first European study of this problem. The symposium will certainly not evade the problem of the two cultures; it actually will go deeply into this problem, as well as into the place of research libraries among the other tools of progress in science and research. So much for LIBER.

The university as an institution has certainly been and still is a major difference between the U.S. and Western Europe. The place of the library within the university has always been part of this difference. I may add that it has always been characteristic of this difference. The thousands of teachers and librarians from Europe who acquired professional experience in the U.S. did not basically change this situation. I shall offer three comments on the environment of the European university library in the seventies. These comments relate to the new university, its new library and professional training at the academic level.

Let me start with the two traditional major differences in the structures of the universities on the two continents. The distinction in the U. S. between undergraduate and graduate students has never had its equivalent in Europe, where everybody thought, but would never say so, that all students were graduates. The medieval pattern of "faculties"--as you know, with a completely different meaning of the word "faculty," than here--is still with us. The reforms which resulted mainly from the student unrest will tend to abolish these two differences in the rather near future, though the concept of faculties will resist longer than graduate snobbishness. The old universities have been proud to distinguish themselves from the technical schools and to care only for the social "elite." These days are gone now. Our universities will be open to the undergraduate concept and will try to train a large group of able technicians required by a sophisticated industrial society. A corollary will be, of course, a new idea of a monority of graduate students dedicated to research in all fields of human endeavour.

Although the gradual disappearance of the medieval pattern will prevail, the reforms which already have been undertaken do not yet indicate a clear-cut trend for the future. New schools within a university, which cut across the classical boundaries of faculties or interfaculty centers, are proliferating in all the older universities, while some new universities already are experimenting with a structure without faculties. Do these trends mean that European universities are moving towards an organizational concept with which you are familiar? My answer would be yes, though I would say that this is not being done consciously.

Looking at the new European university library from such an angle, it is quite obvious that the undergraduate library--in the full sense of the word--will be with us pretty soon. This will be an improvement. The young student who can rely on his father's private library or on his father's pocket to buy all the books he needs has disappeared, but it always takes some time--more in Europe than in the U.S.--to draw the right conclusions from a new situation.

Where European university libraries may take the lead from their parent institutions is in the field of cooperation. The compulsory factors which lead to cooperation are stronger for libraries than for any other department of the university, where the old, obsolete individualism is launching a fierce rearguard action. Quite recently, an American expert has seen, in my country, the university library as the leading factor in cooperation among universities.

When one comes to the problem of professional training at the academic level, one reaches a field where apparently the ocean between the U.S. and the U.K. is smaller than the channel between the U.K. and the European continent. Actually this is not the only field about which this observation is true. On the continent no professional training has been given within the university. Maybe the situation is not quite that absolute, but the observation certainly has general validity. Most library directors give a short introductory course in library science. This cannot be considered professional training. If the university library directors want to be fully accepted professors they have to teach something other than an introduction to library science.

Some changes which occurred lately indicate quite clearly the trend which will be predominant in this decade. The evolution in the Federal Republic of Germany can be taken as an example. Until today library science was not accepted as a university curriculum, because the librarians themselves did not consider it a discipline with a methodology of its own and a subject fit for scholarly investigation. The only exception was the rather narrow field of the history of the book and the hsitory of libraries to which the methodology of historical research could be applied. As such Milkau's famous Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft will go into history as the landmark of the historical school.

Today science curricula include quite a number of "practical" subjects. This has opened the way to a new approach to library science as an academic discipline. Although the history of books and libraries will retain a certain amount of attention, the emphasis will be on a sociological analysis of the library and its function. "Sociology" is used in a broad sense and includes information and communication sciences, individual and group psychology, management theory, business economics, etc. But this new recognition of library science will not necessarily lead to professional training at the university level. I would venture to predict that the decade will be over before this goal will be reached. One should add, however, that this process may be and certainly will be accelerated by two converging factors: the new notion of undergraduate students and the new importance of the technical schools, in which now nearly all professional training is concentrated.

I guess that it has been generally accepted, here as well as in Europe, that the interference of central governments in matters of research and libraries has been much more common in Europe than here. The trend in the U.S. is positively towards an increasing role for the government. After my first visit to this country twenty years ago, I wrote that the U. S. was fortunate in not having a ministry of education, while most of the European research libraries came under such a ministry. Things have changed now here and at home. I do not see, however, a uniform pattern in the changes which are occurring in various European countries.

In the U.K. where opposition to interference by the central authority was certainly stronger than anywhere else in Europe, two important innovations seem to point in the same direction. The Office of Scientific and Technical Information was certainly established in 1965 as a government service, obviously for reasons of direct control over huge amounts of public funds, mostly used to support information for industry. The Dainton Report and the discussions to which it led, resulting in the recent White Paper, The British Library, undoubtedly mean a stronger government interference than in the days when the trustees of the British Museum were directly responsible to Parliament.

West Germany which is still distrustful of central authority--of which it had too much in Nazi times--needs federal investment to match the expenses of the information industry. The Ministry of Science has issued recommendations to improve the university libraries and to delineate responsibilities beyond the university community itself, but the implementation of these recommendations remains the responsibility of local authorities. In the immediate future one may expect the influence of the Volkswagen Stiftung to dominate, which will indirectly be a federal influence since Volkswagen is publicly owned. The Foundation operates, however, quite independently of the government.

I cannot end my paper without referring to the UNISIST scheme. I may be wrong, but I look upon it as the first example of direct American influence through an international governmental organization, Unesco I know that it was the International Council of Scientific Unions, which cooperated with Unesco to make the feasibility study of UNISIST, but when one looks at the work which has been carried out during the last three years, it is easy to see that all major contributions came from the U.S. Those closely involved in UNISIST will answer that the idea is being received with enthusiasm in the U.S.S.R. and this is certainly true. I am no prophet--though thinking about the next decade requires some prophetic courage--but when a UNISIST document, on which all parties have agreed, says that UNISIST is a philosophy, a movement and an organization, I am pretty sure that these three words have different meanings in Washington, Moscow, Berlin and Paris. In the next decade UNISIST will be with us, struggling against tradition and national self-sufficiency because they also will remain with us.

My tentative conclusion can be extrapolated from the UNISIST example. The environment of the university and research library will be less and less different in the U.S. and in Europe. A two-way traffic of influences will be responsible for this converging trend, but the influence from West to East will still remain dominant. Actually, the very idea of influence will be

weakened. The various countries of Europe still in existence in 1980 will have very similar university environments of their own, but some differences will remain, differences between themselves and between them and the U.S. We shall have differently crumbling ivory towers and fading oases, fortunately for all of us.

* * * * *

Discussion

Mr. Bryant (Harvard): Perhaps this is a premature question, but do you think UNISIST is likely to be a reality in the near future?

Dr. Liebaers: Although I am not the best informed person about UNISIST, I believe it will be a reality in January 1972. All of the major powers will be represented at the Intergovernment Conference which will be held in October of this year. The decision will be made at that conference by representatives of the governments, not by the professional societies and organizations. I believe that all governments will vote in favor of establishing UNISIST.

I think it is unfortunate that the important decisions on establishing a world scientific information network are and will be taken by scientists. The implementing of these decisions will then be left to the librarians.

Mr. Rogers (Yale): I was struck by your statement that the concept of the undergraduate is emerging in Europe, while it seems to me that it is diminishing in this country. The reason for its diminution is that different teaching methods are now being used in American universities, which admit undergraduates to seminar and honors programs. I should like to know what you think about the relationship, if any, between the increased awareness of the undergraduate in Europe and our growing tendency to disregard that classification.

Dr. Liebaers: It is often true that when one compares the evolution of educational institutions and methods in different countries it often appears that the trend in one country is being contradicted in another. What has been considered unsatisfactory in one country becomes the ideal of the other, and vice versa. This is probably true in all fields of study.

European students rebelled against our generation because all the teaching at the undergraduate level was ex cathedra. There was no required reading; the professor gave a great many lectures; the students took notes, or they often bought the course notes from someone who had taken the course before; and they simply repeated those notes during the examinations at the end of the year. The students won't stand for this any longer. They wish to go more into what is considered the traditional education of an undergraduate student which emphasizes intensive reading and independent study.

When I spoke about the emerging image of the undergraduate student I did not really have the techniques of education in mind. I was thinking, rather, of the fact that historically when a student entered a European university it was with the objective of becoming a graduate student--and everybody became a graduate, if not in reality at least in his own mind and in the minds of his parents.

Mr. Vosper (UCLA): Those of us from the ARL who recently have had the privilege of informative discussions with some of our European colleagues agree that the European and American experience in higher education has ever more in common. Consequently, we can learn a great deal from each other. I should just like to emphasize the fact that the implication of all this is that the next frontier of research library development is at the international level. That leads me to my commercial. I think that many of the libraries in the ARL could help both themselves and their European colleagues by becoming associate members in the International Federation of Library Associations. This would allow them to participate both on a personal and institutional level in the important library matters of concern to the international community. A number of American university libraries already have joined. On the basis of our experience I can recommend membership highly to everyone here.

Mr. Heron (Kansas): Do you see any change, Dr., Liebaers, in the long-standing tradition in European universities of maintaining a highly decentralized system of libraries?

Dr. Liebaers: Your question illustrates my comment that at times the ocean between the United States and the United Kingdom is smaller than the channel between the United Kingdom and Continental Europe. This matter of decentralized library systems is a classic example. In Continental Europe the university librarian generally has no authority outside the central library. Often there are dozens and even hundreds of what we call institute libraries in the university. These proliferate almost at will. They have no professional staff and there is no satisfactory access to the collections. This is true because they are outside the authority of the university librarian. This is a major problem which hampers the development of university libraries in Europe. The situation in the United Kingdom, on the other hand, is quite different; it is very similar to the situation here in the United States.

I think there may be a change in this area and that European universities may move toward more centralization of their libraries. I am afraid, however, that this will take a very long time. Too many faculty members of European universities remember that old Heidelburg saying, "God invented the professor, but the Devil invented the colleague."

* * * * *

Collective Action by Research Libraries: Problems and Potential

Mr. John McDonald: We have heard today, in the four program sessions preceding this one, from a number of thoughtful observers of research libraries. All the speakers have been, at one and the same time, interested and disinterested commentators on the situation in which we find ourselves in the early part of the 1970's. The panel discussion you are about to hear concerns research libraries working in concert, and seeks to answer the question, "What are the most productive forms of collective action?" What the panelists have to say is intended not so much as a response to what has gone before, as it is a presentation of some of the possibilities for interinstitutional cooperation as seen by several ARL colleagues from libraries of different sizes and types, whose cooperative activities and interests also are different. It has been clear to me from the outset, however, that a small panel such as this, could not hope to present all of the attractive possibilities for collective action. Instead, it is the panel's function to present a few examples for the rest of you to agree with or take exception to, to augment or expand out of your own experiences, and, what is most important, to supplement with entirely new examples not mentioned by any of us.

There can be no doubt that a great deal of thought has already gone into the question of how research libraries can mount a sustained attack upon their most persistent problems. I would mention first of all, the brief but extremely cogent position paper prepared by Jim Haas for the ARL board of directors and recently distributed to the entire ARL membership. The Haas paper emphasizes national programs and mentions the following possibilities: 1) The development of a national serials collection along the lines of the Boston Spa operation, something we shall hear more about shortly; 2) creation of a national collection of negative microfilms with loan copies of prints; 3) a national lending library of books received through NPAC; 4) a processing center for data in machine-readable form; 5) subject-based information centers for the sciences; 6) a national continuing education program for professional members of research library staffs (tomorrow morning's session on staff development in research libraries with David Kaser as moderator and Peter Hiatt as discussant is clearly in the same direction as the Haas proposal; 7) a national bibliographic center; and 8) a book preservation center. So much for Haas. He can and will speak for himself in another program session.

Others have also recently spoken out clearly and effectively on the subject of collective action. They have all spoken previously and often, but their latest remarks are particularly germane in this context. I refer to papers presented by Douglas Bryant, Ralph Ellsworth and Gordon Williams at the meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies on January 22, 1971. On that occasion, Doug Bryant spoke on development of resources, Ralph Ellsworth on bibliographic control, and Gordon Williams on physical access to library materials. Each paper in its way emphasized the value of collective action, and the following quotation from the Bryant paper is typical of this pervasive theme. "If we are moving, as of necessity we must, towards some kind of national planning for research libraries, collaboration between scholars and librarians will become ever more urgent." These three papers, which have been printed in the ACLS Newsletter for January 1971, make excellent reading and there

will be many echoes of them in this panel discussion and in other parts of this two-day program. There will, for example, be points of commonality between all three papers and the topic assigned to Robert Vosper and Neal Harlow, namely long-term objectives for federal legislation in the interest of research libraries. The session on the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, involving Jim Skipper and Ed Applebaum, will surely parallel the Ellsworth presentation, and both Arthur McAnally and Joseph Jeffs will speak of matters close to the theme of Gordon Williams' paper.

What all of this suggests to me is that we have the makings of a consensus, and we need simply to capture its essential elements. Perhaps we can begin to move in the right direction by dealing with specifics, and for that reason I would like now to turn to our panelists who will for the most part deal with realities rather than theories. I should say, first of all, that this panel is a living example of cooperation. Each of these panelists has been called into service as an alternate for an absent colleague originally tapped for this assignment. The reason for this is painfully apparent. You will recall that at our Los Angeles meeting in January, five of our colleagues discussed the relatively new problem of austerity budgets in university libraries. The matter seemed serious enough then, but not so serious that we could have predicted that a number of our colleagues would be unable for resons of restrictions on travel to attend this meeting in Colorado Springs. Anyway, I am grateful to the members of this panel for their willingness to help out on relatively short notice.

I will introduce them in the order in which they will speak. Following the few remarks I mean to make about each, I shall expect them to speak without further interference on my part. Their presentations will be brief, and there will be ample time for questions and discussion after all of the panelists have spoken. Our first panelist will be Myles Slatin, who is coordinator of library and information services at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Myles will speak to us about coordinating library resources in New York State, drawing upon a paper that is a part of a report entitled, Rationalizing Research Libraries in the Seventies, the proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Five Associated University Libraries. This same document contains contributions by other ARL librarians: Warren Boes of Syracuse, Ben Bowman of Rochester, and David Kaser of Cornell. Our next speaker will be Lewis Branscomb, director of libraries at Ohio State University. In forming this panel it seemed to me that no discussion of cooperation among research libraries could be complete without reference to the Center for Research Libraries. Rather than have Gordon Williams restate his persuasive case, himself, I thought it would be better for our present purpose to view the CRL through the eyes of a long-time member. To this end I asked Lewis Branscomb to tell us how the Center has affected one large research library during its several years as a member, and to suggest how it might affect Ohio State in the future.

Next we shall hear from John Berthel, librarian of the Johns Hopkins University, who will describe an effort at regional cooperation. We hear a good deal these days of FAUL, the Five Associated University Libraries;

NELINET, the New England Library Information Network; and the Ohio College Library Center, to mention a few. Surely this type of academic library collaboration deserves a place in our thinking.

Finally, Joseph Jeffs, director of the Georgetown University Library, will speak to us of the national lending library concept. As you know from a recent announcement in the ARL Newsletter, Mr. Jeffs has recently accepted appointment as chairman of a new ARL committee, the Periodicals Resources Center Study Committee, charged with drawing up specifications for a study of the viability of a national lending library for periodicals covering all disciplines. Joe's presentation today will be by way of a progress report on the early activities of his committee.

Now at last to our panelists, starting first with Myles Slatin.

Coordinating Library Development in New York

Mr. Slatin: John, I wonder if you thought of what would have happened if the understudies had laryngitis?

In thinking and talking about the structured coordination and cooperation of libraries in New York State, it is worth remembering the educational structure of the state. The Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York is elected by the legislature, and is the governing body of the University of the State of New York, of which body the State University of New York is only one institution. The University of the State of New York and its executive agency, the State Department of Education, have jurisdiction over all private and educational institutions in the state at every level, and have the ability to charter, to request plans, to fund by contract, and in some cases to review budget requests and appropriations. There is an assistant commissioner concerned with state libraries and the Division of Library Development. John Humphrey fills that position. As far as libraries are concerned, one of the chief functions of the commissioner of education is to develop and then listen to the Commissioner's Committees on Libraries. In the late 1940's and 1950's, the Commissioner's Committees were concerned with the creation of public library systems; through the decade of the 60's they were concerned with reference and research library resources.

The final report of the Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources was published in December 1961. Just about ten years later the report of the Commissioner's Committee on Library Development was released. Shortly thereafter that report was essentially embodied in the first policy statement concerning the library resources of the state ever adopted by the Board of Regents. It is worth repeating very briefly the main points in the development of the library policies of the state, with just slight reference to the fact that the state was instrumental in welding together separate and disparate public library systems into unified and coordinated systems.

In 1961, the Commissioner's Committee found that "a solution to the problem of inadequacies in the availability of reference and research materials in New York must be found" if the state were "to continue its position of economic and intellectual leadership. The solution must be based upon a

total, coordinated program which would include college, university, public, private and special libraries."

The committee recommended the "establishment of a State Reference and Research Library Resources Board of nine members." The board would be responsible for policy determination and for "the operation of statewide services necessary to the development of a reference and research library program." The report also recommended the establishment of a "network of not more than eleven regional reference and research library systems." The model for the proposed system was the public library systems of the state which, in the words of the report, "provide a facility through which all residents, whether or not they are affiliated with an institution engaged in research, may gain access to the proposed chain of library facilities." The report further called "for welding the state libraries into an integrated function--an active, dynamic, communications netowrk--utilizing modern methods of information retrieval, storage, and dissemination...."

The plan proposed by that committee would have cost no more than $8 million a year, which would have been a small price to pay for the proposed accomplishments.

It was not until 1966 that things began to move. In that year, nine regional reference and research library resources councils were created in the state. The 3-R's program had come alive. Membership is essentially optional and inexpensive. In almost every region most libraries belong.

These organizations do exist. They have varying programs, but they are not very well coordinated across the state. There are some general policy guidelines consisting essentially of some "don'ts."

Also in 1966, the Division of Library Development in the State Education Department established the New York State Interlibrary Loan Network. NYSILL is essentially a routing system designed to minotor interlibrary loan request traffic, and see to it that requests get filled as speedily as possible without overloading any one library. Certain libraries, like Cornell, are major referral centers; others, such as Buffalo, backstop a public library system. NYSILL reimburses libraries for searching and for filling requests. It has become an effective and useful instrument for providing materials to a wide variety of users.

The reports of NYSILL transactions are being computerized and the resulting data should prove useful in identifying collection needs in the various regions of the state. In addition, the Association of New York Libraries for Technical Services, ANYLTS, has come into existence. Its pilot plan for automated centralized processing of library materials for the public library systems of the state is now beginning operations on Long Island. Research libraries have not been involved in the planning of ANYLTS.

In 1963 a Nelson Associates' study of a proposal to establish the 3-R's regional system pointed out that the 3-R's program and the development plans for the various graduate centers of the State University should be coordinated. So far State University has done little to coordinate them.

The Bundy Report of 1968, looking at private and public education as a whole and not just at libraries, saw a similar need and expressed a fear that two competing library networks would develop in the state. It concluded that the development of public and private networks would be unfortunate and stated that it was very much in the interest of the state to provide proper compensation for private libraries which share their resources and to insure that the libraries of the public institutions are strengthened and their resources made widely available.

One example of effective cooperation, partly as a result of the activities of the Department of Education and increased activities on the part of City University and State University, has been the attempt to provide additional funds to the New York Public Library, so that it can serve both as a statewide resource and by contract as a graduate research library for City University.

The number and complexity of state educational activities have led to the creation, by reorganization in the Governor's Division of the Budget, of a new mechanism for looking at the total funding of all educational activities in the state. There is now essentially one examiner's office which will be concerned with reviewing for the Governor the budget requests for State University, City University, the various contract colleges, the State Education Department, etc. It seems inevitable that at some point a budget examiner, with nothing else to do on a slow afternoon, will start to add up the money coming to libraries from various sources under various statutes, and begin to wonder about some of the possible areas of duplication.

The 1970 report of the Commissioner's Committee on Library Development extended and widened what it saw as the mission of the state with regard to libraries. It recommended that every citizen be entitled to convenient access to local libraries, "which are part of a statewide network." It recommended that special purpose networks be planned, funded and coordinated by the state, that "every possible means be used to strengthen and coordinate library and library related agencies within the Education Department," and that the State should "develop and enforce standards of service applying to all library agencies supported by public funds." Since at this time most of the Universities in New York State receive public funds, presumably the standards of service to be developed by the State Education Department would apply to them as well as to other library agencies. The central point of the report is its recommendation that the state play a centrally powerful and growing role in the development of a library resources program which will meet the needs of every citizen of the state, using a combination of private and public resources and agencies to do so, and treating all libraries as related parts of the whole.

The Education Department is also preparing to treat institutions of higher education as parts of one whole. The Governor submitted legislation this year to empower the Education Department to widen its program of college credit by examination and give it the power to grant bachelors degrees, independent of any educational institution, by examination. Such a program, of course, would have to carry with it the obligation on the part of some library in the state to assist people taking such examinations in finding the books or other ink-print materials they might have to read.

In these various programs there are some problems, some comforts and some hopes for the future. The program clearly sees that the resources of the libraries of the state are of enormous importance. The attempt to make those resources available to every citizen of the state is clearly in the most distinguished tradition of liberal and enlightened educational philosophy.

It is a comfort to know that the State of New York does acknowledge the unique importance and intellectual power of research libraries. Indeed the Commissioner of Education has just appointed the Advisory Committee on Academic and Research Libraries, which I believe is going to be asked to develop a plan for the academic and research libraries of the state.

There may be some further difficulties, however, because the governing bodies of units within the state library systems, such as a board of trustees, are not aware, as the State University is not aware, that their libraries are already functioning as part of a coordinated public service network, and that the Commissioner has committed us to purposes and policies which may be at variance with the purposes and policies for which our funding and controlling boards think we exist. This is a very small problem now, but it may become a major problem and require some major adjustments in the policy of a given institution. What will the board of trustees of Syracuse say when it is asked to increase its funds for the libraries so that the needs of citizens in small towns of the state may be met? This lack of awareness is partly the fault of librarians, but it's also partly a result of the Commissioner's failure to involve those boards and groups responsible for institutions in planning for library systems.

It is also disturbing that the efforts of the state imply, very strongly, that the problem of acquiring library resources is not a primary one, that either it has been solved or that it can safely be left to the individual initiative of particular libraries and their controlling boards. I am not yet prepared to believe that the problem of acquiring resources has indeed been solved by State University. It is also disturbing that the state is not yet thinking in terms of solving some of the information problems which are outside the range of ink-print. The State Library, for example, has not been active in dealing with some of the problems presented by the census data tapes, which would seem to me to be a problem of great concern to the state of New York. Also, the state, having been bitten or burned once by an attempt to deal with long distance facsimile transmission, has now become conservative in its approaches to technological experimentation.

The future of library development in New York partly depends, of course, on the ability to provide increased funding. Legislation was introduced this year which would have created a formula for funding the 3-R's regions based on a per capita fee for every college student, professional person and qualified researcher in a community. Unfortunately, it did not pass.

If funding is available, and perhaps even if it's not, I look forward to some interesting attempts to define regional needs for certain kinds of library materials. Some of this is already happening in the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library.

I think also that we can look forward to certain kinds of indirect services, such as increased support to libraries for technical processing, which

will make direct access for the public easier and will improve our ability to serve our own populations as well as of those of the region.

What becomes very important as regional systems develop is that regional barriers to library service do not also come into being. There is the need for transregional planning within the state.

John asked me to comment on what the role of the ARL might be in these cooperative efforts. If ARL were richer, it could provide some staff assistance for planning and research.

I think ARL might also be effective in providing a means for improving dissemination of information about planning on a national level and the activities going on at the state level. It could assist in the development of cooperative library agencies which would cut across state or national boundaries. Perhaps the ARL could be of most assistance if it could provide a statement of policy concerning the unique role to be played by research libraries in cooperative library systems. Thank you.

* * * * *

Research Libraries in Concert: The CRL

Mr. Branscomb: The Center for Research Libraries was incorporated in 1949 in Illinois as the Midwest Inter-Library Center by ten universities: Chicago, Illinois, Illinois Institute of Technoligy, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan State, Minnesota, Northwestern and Purdue. Its primary purpose was to increase the research library resources available to these cooperating midwestern institutions. The Carnegie and Rockfeller corporations each provided grants of $1,000,000 for the construction of the building in Chicago, completed in 1951, on land donated by the University of Chicago.

The several different types of activities orginally envisaged were reduced in actual operation to only two: deposit in the Center of infrequently used library materials held by the participating institutions, and cooperative purchase and centralized cataloging and housing of materials in the Center.

My own institution, Ohio State, became a participating member in the MILC on January 2, 1953. It was not a founding member due to the fact that with a massive addition to our main library in progress it might have been argued that the depository privilege would make the addition unnecessary. Ohio State became the sixteenth member of the MILC and installed a teletype immediately, which has been maintained because of its general usefulness to the present time.

The Center grew steadily in programs and membership. By 1963 it had doubled in size from its original ten members to twenty, and demonstrated the soundness and practicality of its original conception. Experience, however, was also beginning to indicate some undesirable limitations. Originally, as the name indicated, the MILC had been conceived of as a regional center to serve only the Midwest.

In 1963 the board of directors of the Center decided that a careful review of all operations and policies of the Center was desirable in the interest of making it as fully and as widely useful as the needs of research libraries required. Accordingly, the board appointed a survey committee to conduct this review, with authority to employ outside consultants. The committee was able to persuade Ray Swank and Stephen McCarthy to make the survey, and their report and recommendations, together with those of the survey committee, were considered by the full membership at a two-day conference at Allerton House in the fall of 1964. The decisions taken at that conference changed dramatically the direction of the Center: there was to be greatly increased emphasis on purchased acquisitions programs, and all geographic restrictions on membership were dropped. At present a substantial percentage of the major research libraries of the nation are members. There are fourty-six full members and twenty-three associate members.

The principal advantages of membership in the CRL are:

(1) The ability to relieve pressures for space by weeding from the local collection older and infrequently used materials and yet still have them readily available by transferring them to the Center.

(2) Fast and easy access to millions of volumes of important materials needed for research that the members cannot afford or justify buying for their own collections. A corollary advantage is the opportunity provided a member library to avoid the acquisition, cataloging, and housing costs of important but expensive materials that will be needed only infrequently.

(3) The ability to work more closely and more quickly with peers in developing new cooperative programs of maximum local interest, and in extending old ones.

As a strong supporter of the CRL from the beginning, I tried to quantify the advantages for Ohio State as I prepared this report. Our data on the volume of materials deposited in the Center are sketchy but what we have indicate that we have made at least twenty-one shipments, some of these being full truckloads. This has eased our crowded situation from time to time, and has had the further advantage of getting out from under foot materials which were almost never used. I remember only one or two cases in the eighteen years of our membership in which we had to recall part of a deposit temporarily for use on campus. At present the depository advantage is minimal because of the increasingly critical shortage of space for deposit at the Center.

The relatively quick and easy access to research materials at a small fraction of the cost of individual purchase is by far the most important advantage for Ohio State and, I would think, for other institutions as well. Again, I can provide little by way of concrete statistics to show how much and how frequently we have "borrowed" items from the Center. However, a study of twenty-three proposals for purchase of collections by the Center for the year March 1970-March 1971 indicates that the cost of collections of interest to us came to $82,176. Proposals for collections in which we have no appreciable interest cost $6,100. Lastly, collections to which we had already subscribed or acquired or decided to buy even if the Center acquired the material came to $21,436. Thus out of a total cost of $109,712 for these purchases, we are able to take advantage of $82,176 without cost except for our annual assessment fee which covers other services as well.

The third function of the CRL, serving as a catalyst for cooperative programs, is illustrated by the successful Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm project, and the creation of a consortium of major universities to pool the costs and share the resources and services involved in the 1970 computerized census tapes. There are many other illustrations of the Center's taking the initiative in setting up cooperative programs of various types. In the future, especially as we enter a period of austerity, I would expect that number to increase.

In addition to the many categories of materials making up its three million volumes, the CRL administers some especially comprehensive and useful programs:

CAMP - Cooperative Africana Microform Project
SAMP - South Asian Microfilm Project
SEAM - Southeast Asian Microform Project
Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm
U. S. Newspapers on Microfilm
Foreign Archives on Microfilm
U. S. Archives on Microfilm
Foreign Doctoral Dissertations in Print and on Microform
Journals Abstracted in Chemical Abstracts and Bibliographical Abstracts Not Received in Member Institutions
U. S. State Documents
U. S. College Catalogs

The assiduous acquisition of materials in these categories relieves member institutions of an enormous burden of purchase, preparation and housing. It is predicated on the fact, so well known to research librarians as to be maddeningly familiar, that all research libraries are desperately dependent upon each other to stay afloat in the tumultuous sea of publications and demands for service.

Use of the Center's collections may be in person or by "loan." "Loan" is not quite the proper word since it implies the temporary use of material owned by another, whereas the members own these resources collectively. Requests by telephone, wire or TWX--all paid for by the Center--normally result in materials being shipped the same day by United Parcel Post Service or by Air Parcel Post, with delivery in three to four days from the time of the original request. The items may be kept as long as needed with a few exceptions.

One of the problems which has faced members from the beginning is the task of publicizing on each campus the enormous resources available quickly from the CRL. Some institutions have filed catalog cards, previously issued by the Center, in their own public card catalogs. This is obviously the ideal arrangement, but it is not without its disadvantages. To avoid these the Center now publishes its catalog in book form. It is divided into three sections: monographs (in five volumes); serials (in one volume); and newspapers (in a separate volume, although they are also included in the serials

volumes). This basic catalog will be kept up to date with annual supplements and periodic cumulations. In addition, the Center has issued a loose-leaf Handbook that is essentially an inventory and description of the Center's collections.

Finally, the Center this year provided for all of its members a sixteen-page pamphlet, "Library Materials Available for Research from the Center for Research Libraries, in as many copies as needed to mail one to each faculty member and to keep a supply for distribution to graduate students and others. In addition many members regularly report on the Center's new acquisitions, and existing collections in their own library newsletter to the faculty.

Despite these devices, however, there is no doubt that more and better ones are needed if we are to make full use of the Center.

Annual assessment fees are based on a formula of two parts. Twenty percent of the Center's budget is divided equally among the members. Eighty percent is divided proportionately according to the five-year average of expenditures by a member for library materials and binding. No member may pay more than 1.75 times what would be an equal share of the budget. In 1970/71 the payments of regular members ranged from $3,657 to the formula's maximum of $16,493.

Part of the Center's budget comes from gifts and grants. In fiscal 1968 the Office of Education made an allocation of $306,003 for the purchase of library materials and $275,000 in 1969. Earlier grants by the National Science Foundation provided subsidies for the Center's acquisition of periodicals abstracted by Chemical Abstracts and Bibliographical Abstracts not received in member institutions. These subscriptions are now being paid for by regular acquisition funds.

In 1968/69 the Center's staff estimated a cost/benefit ratio for its members at $1.00 to $80.00. Considering only the acquisitions purchased by the Center, and ignoring the PL 480 and other gifts, the average dollar of a member's dues provided the equivalent of $45.00 of local acquisitions. These figures are only a partial statement of the financial benefits. The true savings to member institutions are incalculable but clearly even more substantial. It is somewhat analogous to home owners in a town getting water from a central source and sharing the costs rather than each one digging a well, providing his own water and paying more for it.

Any cooperative enterprise has its shortcomings and inadequacies as well as its advantages. I see three principal shortcomings in the operations of the Center:

(1) Insufficient funds for purchase of materials;

(2) Inadequacy of physical facilities;

(3) Failure to obtain strong federal government recognition.

Over the years funds set aside for the purchase of materials, despite government grants and gifts, have been far below an optimal level. In 1950/51 the acquisition budget was $2,500. By 1970/71 it had increased to $270,000. Some major institutions were slow to join the CRL because of the inadequacy of the acquisition budget. But one of the reasons for the inadequacy was too few members. Its present level is the result of a broader base of support.

The second problem is the increasingly critical space shortage in the Center's building. Efforts to attract foundation grants for a badly needed addition have not as yet been productive. This has resulted, as indicated earlier in this paper, in a moratorium on deposits by members of most categories of material, a fact which does not help in attracting new members. Obviously this problem will have to be solved in the relatively near future if the Center is to continue to move forward.

The third shortcoming--that of the failure of the federal government to recognize the responsibility it has for supporting the Center--is basic to the two other shortcomings. The Center is now clearly a very important national facility. It serves not only the needs of the academic community but also those of the government and the general public. The federal government has the responsibility to provide the funds necessary to operate this national asset at its peak of efficiency. No other support, it seems to me, will enable the CRL to reach its full potential in serving the research information needs of the United States.

I am sure that it is obvious to you by now that I am a very staunch supporter of the Center. It is the kind of exciting enterprise in which one has to have faith for a number of years until it begins to pay off. It has begun to pay off and I am confident that its future is brighter than its past.

* * * * *

MARLIN, And Some General Comments On Library Cooperation

Mr. Berthel: We do not know, with any surety, what the most productive forms of collective action may come to be, but I assume we are now in agreement that collective action is rapidly becoming an absolute necessity.

MARLIN, an acronym for Middle Atlantic Research Library Information Network, identifies one modest effort toward collective action by a group of seven university libraries (public and private) that geographically stretch along the Eastern Seaboard's north-south expressways between New Jersey and Maryland. The present membership includes the following university libraries: Delaware, Johns Hopkins, Maryland, Penn State, Pennsylvania, Princeton, and Rutgers.

MARLIN was conceived in several conversations between ARL colleagues at the 1967 ARL summer meeting. These conversations led to the first formal, if exploratory, meeting at Princeton in the fall of that year.

Even four years ago there were many fewer consortia composed of a mixture of public and private institutions than there are now and this mixture

appealed to those of us involved in the early conversations. In addition, we knew that the seven libraries ranged over a wide spectrum in respect to special holdings and that although collecting and service policies were somewhat similar they also revealed an interesting diversity.

The progress of MARLIN has, in some ways, been disappointingly slow, but generally the interest in, and the effort by, the member institutions have quickened in recent months.

MARLIN, as a concept, has been accepted by the administrative officials in each of the institutions, but to date presidents, vice presidents, deans and other such officials have not been involved in consortium meetings. Publicity concerning MARLIN has been circulated on each campus but I doubt if any of our individual faculties have yet revealed a consensus supporting the idea. In this sense and in others MARLIN is still a far cry from organizations such as the Five Associated University Libraries.

The purposes of MARLIN, as stated in its constitution, are: 1) to develop and improve cooperation among the member libraries; 2) to work toward a coordinated policy for long-range library growth and development, with provision for efficient systems, rapid communication among the membership, shared resources, cooperative and coordinated purchasing, and exploration of other areas of cooperation; and 3) to cooperate with other educational, library, and research institutions and organizations within and without its geographical area.

Its structure includes a board of directors, composed of the chief librarians of each member library, and a chairman, vice chairman, and secretary-treasurer, elected by the board. The board holds at least two meetings a year and the chairman is responsible for appointing a variety of standing and ad hoc committees, which meet more frequently and whose responsibility it is to develop specific projects.

We now believe MARLIN will survive. Initially some members doubted its value since all of the seven institutions were already involved in one or more other cooperative projects.

What has MARLIN accomplished?

It has given each of the members a better knowledge of the other libraries in the consortium and made them more aware of the implications for MARLIN of certain policy decisions made on their own campuses. It gave some of us the necessary final push to install TWX equipment, which obviously has uses beyond the consortium. It has resulted in an extension of the no-fee services formerly granted faculty members from each of the cooperating institutions, and more consideration of the needs of their graduate students. It has resulted in or at least speeded up the production and distribution by several member libraries of serial holdings lists and stimulated this effort in the libraries that have not yet completed these lists. It will produce, hopefully in the relatively near future, a guide to the resources of the seven libraries. This guide in addition to describing general acquisition policies, will indicate the scope and nature of the respective libraries' foreign blanket orders, academy and learned society publication holdings, nonbook collection strengths, and other

such information. Hopefully, the information we each gain from the Resources Guide and the use we make of it will lead us gradually into some meaningful cooperative action in acquisition, cataloging, and machine systems.

It is, I suspect, typical of such efforts that the most practical accomplishment to date is in the area of interlibrary loan. There is statistical proof that ILL transactions among the members has not only increased noticeably but that obvious imbalances between the lending and borrowing of items by individual libraries are less apparent than they were initially. The response and delivery time on ILL requests have been speeded. The use of TWX helps explain this, as does the readier use of the telephone, delivery by United Parcel Service, the gradual discovery of unsuspected strengths in the collections of each library, and perhaps even more important an awareness on the part of each library's ILL staff of their responsibility for quick service to fellow members.

This, then, describes some of MARLIN's activities to date.

John McDonald, aware of the shortness of time available to me to prepare my comments for this session, humanely suggested that it might ease my task if I generalized a bit on the theme of collective action.

The reasons we are giving special attention to schemes of collective action are fairly obvious. The evidence accumulating since World War II and particularly since the launching of Sputnik proves that the individual research libraries are progressively less able to satisfy even those legitimate academic hungers apparent on their own campuses. Our most favored institutions, as well as the less favored, face this problem. Harvard, in a recent report, comments on the doubling of its collections, from four to eight million volumes, in the last few years, but in the same paragraph states bluntly that its library is now less capable of delivering to an individual user the materials he wants, at the time he wants them, than was true in the earlier period when its collection was half its present size. We know that the striking growth of our academic population in the past fifteen or twenty years is a factor, as is the publication explosion of inprint and nonprint materials.

There also appears to be some evidence accumulating that research scholars in the physical sciences may be making less, rather than more, use of our collections and services than was formerly true. If this is actually happening, is it a good or bad omen for the future of our research libraries? Is it that the physical scientist reads less than he once did or that he is increasingly turning to one or another of the burgeoning data banks and information services being developed by discipline oriented professional academic organizations, corporations, and mission oriented government agencies? If he is, why shouldn't this cheer us, since it would appear to lighten the pressures on inadequate acquisition budgets? The trouble is that the destiny of our research libraries rests in part on political as well as economic factors. All of us are increasingly aware that in budgetary conversations on our campuses, having to do with the setting of priorities as to how the university should allocate its available monies, the physical scientist shows less and less empathy with library problems as we see them. Is this true because our large research library collections and services are less and less important to him in his highly competitive career? Whatever the cause, the physical scientist, even though he gradually seems to be losing ground to the biological and life scientists

in the seats of power in our universities, remains a strong political force and his views on research libraries and their value to a university are not unimportant.

We are aware of other obvious failures in communication within our individual university communities. One of these failures appears to be related to the difficulty experienced by our faculties, particularly scientists, in modifying the great expectations they developed in the post-Sputnik period. As librarians we consider ourselves more sensitive to the implications of an inevitable change in the life style of universities than do our faculty colleagues.

Perhaps one of the more striking characteristics of present-day scholarship adds to our difficulties: In the last twenty-five to fifty years there has been a truly massive increase of highly specialized knowledge in individual minds and a commensuate increase in ignorance, respecting these specialized insights, in the minds of the rest of us.

If all these developments do not pose sufficient challenge to us, we can always sit back and speculate about one of the continuing failures of our profession, and this is our inability, either individually or collectively, to convince our academic communities of what we see as the proper role of a library within a university. The Booz, Allen and Hamilton study on problems of library management fully documents this failure.

To live in such an atmosphere as I have hurriedly described, is, I suggest, to experience concern, a concern that, depending upon the state of our individual psyches and the financial state of our libraries on any one day, runs the gamut from minor nagging twitches of doubt to a feeling approaching despair.

Is it any wonder we now seek confort in this bleak climate, not in this instance by seeking out a new God (for collective action has been one of our respectable deities throughout the years), but by enlarging his legendary powers, updating him with the help of the new technology, program budgeting, et al., and thus hopefully succeeding in exorcising some of these late twentieth century devils that beset us.

Hence, I suspect that quite properly, if a bit feverishly and perhaps a little late in time, we give added support to our older and more established collective action programs such as the Center for Research Libraries and give birth to our FAULS, NELINETS, and MARLINS, and that we begin investigating, in a serious manner, the potential of a national lending library operation in this country.

I can state with some assurance that man, to a degree, is a creature of fashion. Existing as we do in a climate of opinion wherein the public reveals some disenchantment with certain of the goals and products of higher education, it is probably fortunate for our universities and their libraries that one of the dominant current official fashions seems to be to solve the major problems of our society by cooperative, corporate, and collective action, whether the problem be atmospheric pollution, racial discrimination, the poverty of our inner cities, or possibly the relative poverty of our research libraries.

May the fashion persist, and may we, as librarians, in consort with other groups, act quickly and effectively enough to benefit from this fashion in seeking solutions to some of our difficulties.

* * * * *

The Periodical Resources Center: A Lovely Unicorn

Mr. Jeffs: There's a song recorded by the Irish Rovers called "The Unicorn," and it has as its refrain the expression, "Oh, that lovely unicorn." I believe that even if the lovely unicorn never existed men of imagination would have invented him because somehow the concept of the unicorn is very attractive and almost universal in its appeal.

Similarly, the concept of cooperation among American libraries is attractive and has a broad appeal, but, like the reality of the unicorn, many librarians are questioning whether meaningful cooperation really exists or whether, up until now, we have preserved it mainly in the wishful land of our imagination.

However, librarians have never given up on the possibility that the Uncorn of Cooperation does exist and will be found. So each year they organize expeditions to seek it out in the realm of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, the misty lands of Facsimile Transmission, the remote territory of Microreproduction, the wild reaches of Computer Networking, and the inaccessible valleys of Cooperative Storage. In recent years we find a tendency for groups of libraries to band together in Consortium expeditions in an attempt to capture our elusive Unicorn of Cooperation. Some of these groups of libraries, although admitting they have not captured the Unicorn, feel that they have had glimpses of him, and are encouraged enough to continue their search.

Actually, as my colleagues on this panel have shown, there are many subspecies of the Unicorn of Cooperation. The one which I am charged with addressing today is that of a periodical resources center or, as it has been called by many, a national lending library for periodicals.

It is appropriate to ask at this point: What is the problem or problems that generate an interest in the concept of a national cooperative venture such as this? Do we have evidence that there is a genuine need for such a center? How important is this need in the eyes of American librarians?

First of all, we have to start with a premise, and that is: Accessibility to periodical literature in this country by those who need it is inadequate, and there is the likelihood that access will not improve and may even worsen as time goes on.

This premise stems from the recognition that our present interlibrary loan system is unduly slow and unduly expensive and that there are conditions present which militate against any significant improvement in existing service. There is the added feeling that our three national libraries are not able to fulfill the periodical information needs of most American libraries, that their staffs and spatial problems have already been overtaxed, that they lack many vital materials, that they will not lend or cannot provide reasonably

priced photocopies of certain materials, and that their service is unacceptably slow for the needs of the library users in this country.

There is also the recognition that none of our research libraries is able to acquire all of the periodicals being published around the world in the subjects included in their collecting policies. In other words, comprehensiveness of collection in all fields is no longer possible. Already, reassessment of collection policies is taking place and reduction of subscription lists is occurring. The added costs generated by increased periodical output, coupled with the inflationary spiral and the reality of constricted budgets, will likely intensify this trend.

Further, we realize that certain research libraries are shouldering an undue burden of the interlibrary loan demands in this country, and, in light of their own financial problems, that they will be forced to cut back in some way on this free service. There is evidence that the demands made on these libraries by emerging and developing institutions and community colleges are increasing, and that these groups of institutions will continue to have a need for periodical resources beyond their own collection capacities and beyond the capacity of major research libraries to serve them. In addition, industrial, business and commercial organizations engaged in research and development and certain federal agencies have a need for periodical resources beyond their own capacities.

Finally, there is the suspicion that there is a great deal of unnecessary duplication of little-used (and often quite expensive) periodicals in American libraries, and that much of this could be eliminated if libraries were assured of having rapid access to this material when the need to use it arose. There is the probability that, given the existence of an effective periodical resources center, certain libraries would discontinue some subscriptions and others might choose to discontinue binding and storing certain periodical titles.

There is another premise--probably much more basic than the one previously stated--which should be mentioned at this point, because it would provide the rationale for federal support of a periodical resources center. It is that information is an essential national resource; and, since much of this resource is contained in periodicals, we utilize it most effectively by making periodicals readily available. In accepting this premise, we are accepting the concept that the ready availability of information is such an important asset that we should place it on a par with other national assets and that we can justify whatever necessary costs are involved in extending access to it. Unless we can convince ourselves and others of the validity of this permise, it is questionable whether we can justify the establishment of such an expensive cooperative venture to those who can provide the necessary funding.

Until now, I've talked about a periodical resources center without really defining what I mean by it. Actually, an exact definition is impossible at this stage, because no official study has been made which would determine the nature of the center and the scope of its activities. One of the functions of the recently appointed ARL Periodical Resources Center Study Committee is to determine whether or not there is a need to investigate this concept in depth, and, if so, to point out specific areas needing investigation. It is expected that the report of the committee will form the basis of a grant proposal for an in-depth investigation or a feasibility study.

For the sake of discussion, let me oversimplify and define a periodical resources center as a national facility established to collect in depth and lend with speed periodicals in determined subject fields. This definition leads to questions regarding both the nature of the center, the scope of its collection and the extent of its services. For example:

Should there be a single center, or a number of regional centers?

What subject fields should its collections cover?

Should it be limited to periodicals only, or should it collect other serials and even certain other materials, such as conference and research reports, and federal and state documents.

Should it be selective or comprehensive in its current subscription policies?

How much retrospectively published material should it attempt to acquire?

Should collection policies be different for different subjects?

Should its collection exclude by policy certain categories of material, e.g., children's periodicals, newsletters and house organs?

Should it solicit or accept bulk gift materials? On what basis?

What role should microforms play in its stock?

Should it exclude commonly held titles? To what extent?

Should its collection be limited to periodicals which are indexed or abstracted?

Whom should it serve? All libraries or only members libraries? What about individuals?

Should it be a point of first or last resort?

Should it lend hard copy only, provide photocopies only, or offer both depending upon the nature of the material and the wishes of the user?

Should it offer any bibliographic, reference or other services? If so, to what extent?

Should it provide a referral service for unfilled requests?

At this point, the questions are endless, and I mention the above only to illustrate some of the important areas needing study before a final determination can be made about the nature of a periodical resources center.

To these basic questions about the nature of the beast and the scope of its collections and services, it is necessary to add further questions about

initial funding, operational costs, location, building determination, operational procedures and use policies, and--most important--the question as to who will direct and administer a center. Obviously, ARL libraries have a vital interest in all of these considerations, but so will all other American libraries. Further, the initial and operational funding will have a significant influence on the direction and administration of a center. For example, some people can easily accept the suggestion that it should be completely funded by the federal government, but have they faced the question as to what this means in terms of control?

To me, it seems impossible that a periodical resources center can be established without significant federal or foundation funding, but I can conceive of a center--once established--operating successfully on a combination of federal and foundation grants, and membership and/or user transaction fees. It seems reasonable to suggest that if American librarians really feel there is a need for such a center they will be willing to contribute in some way to its support. In so doing, they will have a stronger voice in determining its nature, scope, services and policies.

So far I have deliberately talked in a kind of vacuum, as though the concept of a periodical resources center could be considered independently. I recognize that in reality nothing can be farther from the truth. A feasibility study of a periodical resources center must be concerned with its relationships and interactions with:

The three national libraries

The Medlars Project

The Center for Research Libraries

PL 480

The Farmington Plan

The various secondary information services (i.e., the abstracting and indexing services)

Operational or planned library networks (like the Agricultural Sciences Information Network)

The numerous interlibrary cooperative groups and consortia now in existence.

Certainly the emergence of a successful periodical resources center on the American library scene is bound to influence in a number of ways the relationships among consortium libraries in terms of cooperative acquisition and retention policies and interlibrary delivery activities. A fast efficient center offering free or low-unit-cost service will make every library administrator scrutinize carefully his other local or regional interlibrary cooperative activities.

Is there likely to be any resistance to the concept of a periodical resources center from any of the above libraries, groups or programs? Certainly, a center would have an impact on most of them in terms of their own collection policies and service levels.

What effect would a periodical resources center have on scholarly periodical publishers if an appreciable amount of subscription cancellations resulted from decisions to rely on the center for given titles?

What effect would a periodical resources center have on reprint publishers and microform publishers? I offer this question, not as one concerned with the profit margins of these companies, but as one concerned with the willingness of someone to make available needed retrospective runs of journals and other important printed source materials. Much as we abhor some of the outrageous profiteering that has taken place in the last five years by certain reprinters, we must face up to the fact that important material has been brought back into print by their initiative and in some cases by their willingness to take considerable financial risks.

As a final consideration, I would suggest that a feasibility study must examine seriously the alternatives to the creation of a periodical resources center. As a minimum, the following alternatives should be explored:

1. Whether a concerted effort to improve the present interlibrary services and the collections of our three national libraries could not be undertaken to the point where among them they had everything needed, were willing to lend or provide free or inexpensive photocopies, and had the space and staff to provide this service expeditiously.

2. Whether the establishment of a network of strategically located existing libraries shouldn't be attempted with a beefing-up of their collections so that they could serve as regional interlibrary loan centers, with the concomitant recognition that these libraries must be compensated for their services and provided with special funds for the strengthening of their collections to desirable levels.

3. Whether the establishment of a national interlibrary loan bibliographical center would better serve interlibrary loan needs in this country by providing instantaneous data via TWX or computer terminal, on the whereabouts and availability of periodicals throughout this country.

Until now, I have successfully avoided mentioning Great Britain's National Lending Library for Science and Technology or, as it is popularly called, Boston Spa--from its location near that small town in Yorkshire. This is a very successful national interlibrary loan center. Its collections cover primarily journals in the areas of science and technology, but it has been expanding rapidly into the field of the social sciences, and is giving considerable thought to further expansion into the humanities. There is much that we can learn from its establishment, its growth patterns and its use experiences, but we must recognize that as a model it has certain limitations. Because of our geographical differences, the differences in the effectiveness of our postal services, in attitudes toward libraries and information

services among our political administrators, in strengths in our academic and research library structures, and, finally, the difference in conditions which spawned an initial interest in the concept in both countries, it is obvious that we must chart our own course in determining whether or not we need a periodical resources center and what its nature should be. If we do establish a center, then I think we have much to learn from Boston Spa in terms of organization and administration.

In this general field of learning from the experiences of others, it would seem logical to me that we would want to investigate very thoroughly the activities of the Center for Research Libraries and similar cooperative lending and storing facilities to discover if their experiences can help us in determining the feasibility of a periodical resources center.

Let me say that the questions I have raised today grow mostly out of the initial investigations and discussions of the Periodical Resources Study Committee. Certainly there are others which must be considered. We hope that you will communicate your own ideas and reactions to the committee so that they can be considered for incorporation in our report.

The Ford Motor Company has a current commercial which plays on the expression, "A better idea whose time is now." I think that in applying it to the concept of a periodical resources center we could recognize the many people who have been advocating such a center for a number of years by paraphrasing the expression to read, "An old idea whose time is now."

* * * * *

Mr. McDonald: I want to thank the panel for these presentations. They have provided useful examples of cooperative activities--from Myles Slatin's account of what might be called over-cooperation; to Lew Brancomb's candid report on Ohio State's more than eighteen years of membership in the CRL; to John Berthel's clear description of an increasingly popular type of regional collaborative; to Joe Jeffs' image-laden and provocative progress report on the national lending library concept. I trust that these ideas will stimulate all of you to suggest other ways in which research libraries may move forward together in the future. The membership should not lose sight of the fact that any discussion of research libraries working in concert must include consideration of the ARL itself. You are all aware that in the business meeting tomorrow a new committee structure for the Association will be presented by President Buckman. This new structure and how it may contribute to the effectiveness of the organization are matters for serious consideration. So, too, is the future role of the ARL Office of University Library Management Studies. It may well be the interinstitutional cooperation will figure so greatly in the future management of research libraries as to require concerted study and research on the part of the Management Office.

Finally, we must take a long, hard look at Neal Harlow's paper on the long-term objectives of research libraries in respect to federal legislation. We must decide whether we are really serious about collective action, and determine how best to strengthen the ARL as our representative to the federal government.

Mr. Buckman: We shall try to move ahead briskly with our agenda which, although short, contains two very important topics. Those are the report of the Membership Committee and the discussion of the proposed new committee structure for the Association. Mr. Locke, chairman of the Membership Committee will present the report of the committee and lead the discussion.

Report of the Membership Committee

Mr. Locke: Those of you who were at the meeting in Los Angeles know why I am here as chairman of the committee. I made the mistake of commenting rather vigorously on the report of the last Membership Committee. Quite naturally, President Buckman asked me in early April to chair the committee this year. How could I refuse?!

No such apologies are necessary for the other members of the committee, Arthur Hamlin and John Gribbin. Unfortunately, John isn't able to be with us today, but his associate, Charles Miller, will represent him.

Everyone by now should have a copy of the report. As you can see, it breaks a fair amount of new ground for the Association. Consequently, we should go over each part with some care. The more discussion we have here today, the better the final document. [The report appears in these Minutes as Appendix E.]

The board of directors has suggested the following procedure. Today we shall discuss this report, which should be considered a preliminary or draft report. On the basis of the comments made by the membership, the committee will prepare what it considers to be its final report and present it to the board for consideration at its meeting in October. It then will be presented to the entire membership for final action in January 1972. We don't propose, therefore, to take any final action today on any of the points in the report. We are here to discuss them thoroughly.

I am going to assume that you have had time to read the report, and begin by looking at the first recommendation of the committee: That the criteria for membership be voted by the members. I think this recommendation meets with general approval. Another aspect of it, however, has come up. Several individuals have suggested that the criteria adopted should be reviewed from time to time. The Committee assumed that would be the case, because if the criteria were voted upon by the members the members could change them as they wished. It may be better, however, to speak to this matter of periodic review specifically. Consequently, I suggest that we might add to the recommendation a statement that the criteria would be reviewed from time to time. Is there any discussion on this first recommendation?

Mr. Frantz (Virginia): The Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL) has prepared standards for membership which include built-in annual percentage increases in each of the criteria used. This was done to insure the integrity of those libraries which are voted membership. I suggest that this procedure might be followed by the ARL.

Mr. Locke: If there were an annual percentage increase in each of the categories the number of new members would be quite small, I think. The threshold for admission would move continually upward.

Mr. Fussler (Chicago): It might be better to state that the criteria, rather than being reviewed from time to time, would be reviewed at specific intervals. This would avoid the impression that the Association might arbitrarily raise the admission standards just as certain institutions approach the qualification point. A specified review time, perhaps every two years, would avoid this pitfall.

Mr. Locke: A two-year review sounds good to me. May I ask for a show of hands on this recommendation. There appears to be general agreement.

The suggestion also has been made that we should build in an "inflation factor" for those criteria dealing with expenditures. This would mean that those categories would automatically rise each year by the percentage of inflation. Those of you who agree with this suggestion please raise your hand. I see about five or six. How many feel that the two-year review can stand without an annual inflation factor? It is evident there is much more support for this latter procedure.

Mr. Dix (Princeton): I believe that the point made by Herman Fussler is the correct one. We must have some way of avoiding the impression of tinkering with the formula in order to keep a library out of the Association. The only way to accomplish this, it seems to me, is to develop an automatic formula as suggested by Ray Frantz.

While I am on my feet I should like to make a general statement about the size of the ARL. I think that the Association is just about as large as it should be. We have reached the size limit for effective discussion. The smaller discussion groups this morning were very lively and resembled the former discussions which were held among the total membership. I urge that in developing the criteria for membership we do so with the view of keeping the Association at its present size. A progressive percentage increase in each of the criteria might accomplish this.

Mr. Hamlin (Temple): The committee did discuss the subject of automatic percentage increases for each criterion. What bothered me is that assigning a valid percentage would be very difficult. There are factors in our economy that make it difficult to anticipate properly the increase in operating expenditures, including salaries and wages. I think we can do this every two-years, but I doubt that anyone can figure a percentage increase that would stand the test of time.

The committee is also very conscious of the fact that it might, in its innocence, be recommending a radical alteration in the nature of the Association. We took this matter very seriously. It is fair to say that the committee did not wish to change in any significant way the nature of the ARL. On the other hand, the adoption of objective, quantitative criteria for membership opens up the possibility of increasing the size of the membership considerably. We must all give this a good deal of thought and enter into that decision carefully.

Mr. Vosper (UCLA): I feel as Bill Dix does about the need to keep the ARL relatively small. I speak as one who was deeply involved in 1962 in significantly enlarging the size of the ARL. I don't believe we have absorbed the impact and implications of that action as yet. We should keep in mind that in 1963 this Association decided that it had to be more than a discussion club; it has to be an action group. Now rapid and effective action gets more difficult if we grow too large. I don't believe we should commit ourselves to that course of action without a great deal of thought. I prefer frequent review of admission criteria rather than an automatic increase based on a set formula.

Mr. Orne (North Carolina): If we decide that the criteria for membership should increase continually, we face the prospect of losing some members who fall below the admission standards because of a curtailment of support within their institutions. I recognize this could have a beneficial impact in that the librarian could then bring this matter to the university administration and use it to lobby for more funding. On the other hand, the fact that a given library is growing only very slowly may indicate that it is not measuring up to its fellow institutions and should lose its membership. I don't know how to resolve this question and still keep the size of the Association manageable.

Mr. Frantz: The criteria could be changed according to a scale based on the averages for those criteria among ARL members. For example, one of the criteria might be that a library expend three-fifths of the average figure for total expenditures. As expenditures increase the admission criteria for this category would automatically increase. It would decrease if hard times were to hit all of us. This fluctation, it seems to me, would be fair to everyone.

Mr. Blackburn (Toronto): Having been on the Membership Committee when it was a "secret organization," I feel that we should have clear, objective and known criteria for membership. I further think that the idea of a two-year review is a good one. At the same time, I favor some kind of "rising floor" even though I realize that it is difficult to work out a percentage formula which would work from year to year. For example, with regard to the number of volumes in a library, could we say that library holdings had to be 750,000 volumes in 1971, and that there had to be an annual increment of 40,000 at least?

Mr. Locke: I think that would be a complicated procedure. Further, the committee feels that we should base our judgments on published statistics. We feel that the simplest procedure would be the best.

Mr. Blackburn: My point is that in 1971 the criterion for number of volumes would be 750,000; in 1972, 790,000 and it would continue to rise by 40,000 volumes annually.

Mr. Haas (Columbia): I am still bothered by this matter of using size as the basis of the definition of a research library. It seems to me that we really are looking for libraries with research support capabilities. These can be measured in different ways, and this will be even more true in the future. Ten years from now we may view this matter of size as relatively unimportant.

Mr. Locke: It is true that the ten criteria for membership proposed by the committee are strictly numerical, but I don't think we are saying that

they define a research library. The present bylaws allow for a qualitative approach. At this point, the committee isn't certain how to work this approach into our recommendations.

Mr. Kellam (Georgia): I think the quantities the committee has recommended for the ten criteria are too low. I think the standards developed by the ASERL should be considered as a guideline.

Mr. Locke: The committee would appreciate receiving a copy of those standards.

Mr. Hamlin: Everyone should realize that not all of the present members of the ARL meet the quantitative criteria recommended by the committee, even though these figures were arrived at by referring to the smaller members of the Association.

Mr. Locke: It certainly was not my intention that any present members of the Association be dropped. Perhaps we have a slight difference of opinion here among the committee members.

Mr. Hamlin: I didn't mean to suggest that anyone should be dropped, but I wanted to emphasize that the figures we came up with were drawn from the bottom of the scale of the present membership.

Mr. Weber (Stanford): I think we should devise a sliding scale for each criterion, based on the annual statistics of the ARL.

Mr. Locke: We have touched now on a fundamental question: Should there be a grandfather clause which would prevent any present member of the Association from being dropped because it did not meet the new quantitative standards for admission? A sliding scale for each criterion could result, during periods of economic stress, in a number of libraries being dropped. As someone pointed out, this may be an advantage because those libraries could use this action to get more funds from their universities. I'm somewhat skeptical of this.

Mr. Fussler: I suggest that we have a third option and that is a regular review by the Membership Committee which may involve either a fixed formula or a sliding scale. The committee could abandon a fixed set of numbers at the end of two years if the membership wishes to give it that freedom.

Mr. Locke: The members can of course always vote to eliminate or change any of the criteria. Consequently, anything we decide at the meeting next January can be changed at a future date. I think it would be helpful if the committee could have a sense of the membership regarding the use, on the one hand, of a fixed set of numbers for each criterion, or, on the other, a sliding scale formula such as that used by the ASERL. Please keep in mind that both options could be reviewed by the membership and the Membership Committee. Those in favor of a sliding scale formula please raise your hands. Now those who would like a fixed set of numbers to begin with which would be reviewed every two years. Let the record show that the fixed numbers has a very slight edge. This leaves the committee in a difficult position. Perhaps we shall bring back two suggestions at the January meeting and let the membership vote its preference.

Mr. Carroll (Missouri): I should like to speak to the point raised by Mr. Weber about using the ARL statistics as a basis for the quantitative criteria for membership. These statistics need to be more accurately defined. At present there are too many variables in them which preclude the accurate picture needed if they were to be used as a yardstick for new members.

Mr. Locke: May we now turn to the second recommendation: That ARL statistics be expanded to include figures on current serial and journal titles, on the number of doctorates awarded in certain broad fields, and on the total number of doctorates awarded.

The committee feels that these figures would provide prospective members, the Membership Committee and the board of directors with comparable statistics from members of the Association which could be used validly to judge the statistics supplied by applicants.

Mr. Branscomb (Ohio State): I should like clarification of the term, "doctorates." Are we talking about Ph.D.'s only, or are we including such professional degrees as doctor of medicine, doctor of education, doctor of jurisprudence, etc.?

Mr. Locke: The committee has listed a number of broad subject fields in its appendix to the report. You will notice that it includes the subjects of law, medicine and education. For the moment then we are talking about doctorates, not just Ph.D.'s.

Mr. Frantz: We might want to consider as a criterion the number of doctorates offered by a university, rather than the number of doctorates awarded.

Mr. Locke: The committee decided that doctorates offered is not a measure of the activity of a graduate school. Many universities offer many doctorates which are rarely granted because there is little interest in the subject. That is why we decided to focus on doctorates awarded. Notice that we have recommended a three-year average in order to take care of fluctations.

Mr. Hamlin: I have always felt that it would be better if this criterion would exclude professional degrees such as doctor of medicine and doctor of jurisprudence. I would define "Doctorate" as a Ph.D. or an equivalent research degree which requires publication of original research. I believe that would exclude MD's and JD's and possibly some others. It bothers me, however, that this definition would exclude the new teaching doctorates.

Mr. Locke: How does the membership feel about accepting Mr. Hamlin's definition of the doctorate, which is restricted to the Ph.D. or equivalent research degrees?

Mr. Kellam: I am in favor of Mr. Hamlin's definition. The MD and the JD simply are not comparable to the Ph.D. I should also like to say that we should be able to determine that an applicant for membership has the library materials to support the doctorates being offered. I think we must get into this field.

Mr. Locke: That is an important point but I am afraid doctorates always will be offered with insufficient materials in the library to support

them. For example, MIT is offering a new Ph.D. in health, science and technology and I assure you there are no suitable library materials at MIT to support this program. We are counting on the Harvard/Countway Medical Library. My experience indicates that the doctorates offered have no relationship to library strengths. There is some greater hope that if a university actually is giving degrees in a subject field the library is being strengthened in that field.

Mr. Branscomb: I support both Mr. Hamlin and Mr. Kellam's recommendation that we restrict doctorates to Ph.D.'s. May I say at this time your recommendation of 150 doctorates awarded annually appears to me to be somewhat high.

Mr. Locke: My best guess is that there are now eleven members of the ARL whose universities do not give on the average 150 doctorates a year.

Mr. Lorenz (Library of Congress): Is the committee recommending that the number of doctorates awarded be an absolute criterion for admission? If you are, you would then be dismissing from the Association its nonuniversity library members. The Library of Congress would have to drop out.

Mr. Locke: There is a sentence, perhaps it is buried in the report, which states that the present recommended criteria concern only university libraries. Further, the Membership Committee thinks that within the next year appropriate criteria for nonuniversity members should be developed.

Mr. McAnally (Oklahoma): I wish to go back for a moment to this matter of definition of doctorates, especially with regard to the medical and law degrees. I am reluctant to see them excluded from consideration, because they are traditional and important parts of the university and have been for some 900 years. Further, most medical schools are getting around to awarding a research doctorate as well as an MD. I hold no particular brief for the doctor of jurisprudence, but historically the law school has been an integral and fundamental part of the university. On this historical basis alone, I would favor leaving the JD in. I think the MD by all means should be left in.

Mr. Locke: Perhaps a show of hands on this matter of the proper definition of doctorates would be in order. Those who would like to see our criteria include only Ph.D.'s and other research doctorates should raise their hands. How many would favor the more general definition of doctorates, which would include such degrees as the MD and the JD? It appears that the more strict definition is preferred.

Aside from this question of the definition of doctoral degrees, I should like to know if the majority approves of the second recommendation relating to serial and journal titles and the number of doctorates awarded. Let the record show that the majority approves the second recommendation.

The third recommendation is that the criteria for selection to membership be quantitative.

Mr. Rogers (Yale): What has been said thus far shakes my confidence in purely quantitative standards. I feel very strongly that we must have the intestinal fortitude to pass on members recommended for admission to the ARL.

Therefore, I favor qualitative as well as quantitative criteria. I don't think that admission should be automatic when certain quantitative standards have been achieved.

Mr. Heron (Kansas): Did the committee consider possible qualitative criteria and how they might be used?

Mr. Locke: On the basis of the discussion in Los Angeles, the committee felt that the ARL should get away from qualitative judgments, which are subjective, and focus on quantitative factors only.

Mr. Hamlin: It should be pointed out that the committee did not develop this report in isolation; it did meet with the officers of the Association to get their advice. We did consider the possibility that the use of quantitative standards only would admit a university library which really wasn't qualified. It was generally agreed that the vigor and vitality of the ARL would not be destroyed by one "rotten apple."

Mr. Branscomb: I agree with Mr. Rogers, at least in theory. The problem that troubles me is coming up with fair and meaningful qualitative criteria. I think I would prefer to rely on quantitative factors and upon the flexibility which I see in recommendation number five to take care of the very few cases where we think subjective judgments must be brought to bear.

Mr. Fussler: Does your complete reliance on quantitative criteria obviate Article II, Section 2, of the present bylaws which refers to qualitative judgments?

Mr. Locke: I guess it would be proper to say that we favor striking out that particular section of the bylaws.

Mr. Fussler: If that section is dropped, how will you handle the problem of consortia asking for membership as consortia?

Mr. Locke: That is an important consideration and perhaps we shall have to speak to the matter of consortia separately. It seems to me, however, that it may be possible to arrive at quantitative criteria which will admit the major research libraries and keep out those which do not measure up.

Mr. Bryant (Harvard): I must emphasize what someone said earlier about relying on quantitative criteria which aren't accurate. The annual statistics of the ARL allow a good deal of latitude with regard to what an individual library reports. If we rely solely on statistics we are going to have to make absolutely certain that the statistics furnished are comparable.

Mr. Locke: The committee agrees completely. We feel that the ARL statistics should be adequately defined to provide a proper basis for comparison. We also may use the statistics prepared by the National Center for Educational Statistics which are fairly well defined.

May I ask a show of hands from those who favor a quantitative basis for membership. The record should show that the majority favors quantitative criteria.

The fourth recommendation is that admission to the Association will be automatic for any university library which meets the quantitative criteria.

Mr. Boss (Tennessee): I agree with a combination of high quantitative standards and automatic admission, but I also feel that the committee should develop some written qualitative criteria to cover the kind of exceptions which will be allowed.

Mr. Jackson (Pennsylvania State): I agree with Mr. Boss and urge that such qualitative criteria be developed. Otherwise, we could have an unhealthy political situation develop.

Mr. Locke: If we are not careful we could wind up with a group of more or less unattainable quantitative criteria and a lot of libraries coming into the Association through the "qualitative door."

Mr. Orne: I am concerned that automatic membership means that we shall not be able to restrict the size of the Association.

Mr. Locke: If invitation to membership is not automatic, then in effect there is no quantitative criteria. The committee feels that the proper procedure is to put the criteria high enough to insure a reasonable size for the Association. Do we have any further comments on the fourth recommendation?

Mr. McDonald (Connecticut): If we agree with Bill Dix that the membership of this organization is now at about the right size, we don't need criteria of any kind. If we do not agree with Bill but do wish to keep the growth factor small, then it seems to me the committee has a fairly clear charge, and that is to set quantitative standards which will admit research libraries as they come of age, but in very small numbers.

Mr. Locke: This was exactly the intent of the committee and this draft report is based on that philosophy. We expect the Association to grow slowly as university libraries come of age. One could, of course, limit arbitrarily the size of the Association to a certain number of members.

Mr. McDonald: I would rather see us do that--set an absolute size for the ARL--than to pretend that we are open-ended on size and continue to apply qualitative standards in an uneven fashion.

Mr. Cole (St. Louis U.): A comment on John McDonald's point. If the membership of the Association is to be set at an artibrary number, then I think it necessary that those libraries, which qualified twenty years ago on qualitative factors, probably would not qualify at this time. We should be prepared to consider this matter of having to drop members from the Association.

Mr. Blackburn: If I were the librarian of a library whose growth rate was very slow and was therefore informed that we were being dropped from the ARL, I would not be unhappy. I would use that action by the Association to convince the administration to give us more support.

Mr. Locke: It was not the intention of the committee that any member would have to withdraw because of the new standards. But your statement really brings us to the next recommendation: That in exceptional cases the ARL should feel free to admit university libraries not meeting the criteria.

This statement implies that anyone who is admitted on the basis of special qualitative criteria will not be dropped because they don't meet quantitative criteria. This leads me to believe that no one else will be dropped either. I had proposed to clarify this matter by adding a few words which would say that these special cases and some of our present members would not have to meet any new set of criteria which the membership adopts. I believe that was the intent of the committee, but I am not sure that we really came to a definite decision about a floor for each criterion below which a member could not fall without being asked to withdraw.

Mr. Jackson: I think there really has to be some kind of periodic review of the special members. We should apply the same reasoning to them as is applied to those members which are members because they have met quantitative standards. At some time these exceptions may cease to be dynamic libraries. In that case, they should not be members of the ARL.

Mr. Orne: Any institution will use its membership in the Association to influence its administration for proper support. Any library can experience financial cutbacks. This situation might be alleviated if there were the threat that a library would lose its membership in the ARL if it fell beneath certain standards. I support setting a basic floor for each criterion.

Mr. Hamlin: I wonder if we could have an expression of opinion about a warning period for those libraries which fall below the accepted standards. It occurs to me that a warning of perhaps two or three years would give the librarian involved a chance to really deal with his administration and use the threat of nonmembership as a lever for some improvement.

Mr. Locke: May I see a show of hands from those who agree with Mr. Hamlin's recommendation? Let the record show that there is a very clear majority in favor of this procedure.

Is there any other discussion of this fifth recommendation. Keep in mind that if special consideration is given to certain libraries, those libraries also will be subjected to periodic review.

Mr. Weber: I think libraries which fall below standards should be put on probation upon the reocmmendation of the board of directors and approval by three-fourths of the ARL members voting by secret ballot.

Mr. Locke: That sounds like a good idea. Now to the sixth recommendation which deals with the specific quantitative criteria to be used in ten different categories. This is a difficult matter and I remind the membership that the committee in arriving at these figures was not trying to define a research library.

Mr. Fussler: You imply the possibility of requesting from libraries statistical data which they do not now supply to any agency. Perhaps we could partially solve this problem by using ranges of numbers for each criterion. This would get away from the idea that a library with 1,278,000

volumes is significantly better than the library which has 1,271,000 volumes. Broad ranges might be equally useful.

Mr. Locke: It should be noted that all of these statistical categories are now reported to some agency. All are reported to the Office of Education or to the ARL.

From the Floor: Is it the intent of the committee that any library which fails to meet any one of these ten criteria would not, therefore, qualify for membership.

Mr. Locke: Yes, that is the intent of the committee. We are convinced that these standards will allow us to admit only two or three really qualified libraries at any one time. I don't think we would find as someone has suggested, that there are quite a few large university libraries not in the ARL which meet all of these standards.

Mr. Chapin (Michigan State): These figures, if they are used, will have to be defined very carefully. For example, it would be possible for a library to spend more money for library materials than the stipulated standard, but add fewer volumes than required each year.

Mr. Orne: I don't know if we should discuss the specifics of these criteria now, but it does occur to me that the figure of 750,000 volumes in the library is no longer a very good figure.

Mr. Locke: The committee will give very careful attention to each of the figures it has suggested. In the meantime, I wish the membership would look at them as a unit. Meanwhile, we shall look at the figures in use by the Southeastern Research Libraries and compare them to those we have recommended.

Mr. Slatin (Suny-Buffalo): I represent an institution which is reducing its budget while increasing its student body. I wonder whether the committee gave any thought to developing criteria which show the relationship between the size of the library, its budget and staff on one hand, and the size of the population it is supposed to serve on the other.

Mr. Locke: That would be a very difficult criterion to develop, and I see that Mr. Hamlin agrees with me.

Mr. Boes (Syracuse): I don't believe that statistics for printed volumes are enough. I think microform holdings will have to be part of that criterion.

Mr. Locke: The committee thought it better to consider only printed volumes at present and to defer the consideration of microform holdings to a later date.

Mr. Cole: Yesterday in this room we heard a good deal of emphasis placed upon cooperation among both universities and their libraries. The standards for admission into the Association do not reflect this emphasis. For example, did the committee think of asking for the amount of money a library spends on regional cooperation? Such cooperation could conceiveably result in a reduction of the budget of a given library because the parent institution has agreed

to give Samoan Studies to a neighboring institution. Another example is the amount of money spent on computer-related activities. A library may have made a conscious decision to spend a great deal in this area instead of simply adding to its collection size.

One last point. We all have heard about the restructuring of curricula which is now going on within universities. This restructuring does on occasion involve the MD and JD degrees. They are being "humanized." They are going to resemble more and more the traditional Ph.D. degree and yet we are going to eliminate them for consideration in determining the number of doctorates awarded by a university.

Mr. Locke: The agreement that any set of criteria for membership should be periodically reviewed will allow the Membership Committee and the entire membership of the Association to reconsider its past actions and to change them as the times dictate.

One topic that we haven't resolved is this matter of consortia of universities and their libraries. We must somewhere define a university library in a useful way. At this point I do not have a specific proposal. We have been talking about criteria for university research libraries, but we have no definition of a university library. Since I have nothing to offer at this time, I ask for suggestions from the membership in the near future. The committee will certainly consider each of them.

I commend everyone in the audience for his patience and his contribution to this discussion.

* * * * *

Report on a Proposed New Committee Structure for the ARL

Mr. Buckman: I should like now to elicit comments on the proposal to develop a new committee structure for the Association. I must take responsibility--or perhaps the blame--for this idea and for the report which I believe everyone here has received. If it is a good report then I must share the credit with Jim Haas, John McDonald and Steve McCarthy who subjected my basic concept to vigorous and effective criticism. [The report appears in these Minutes as Appendix F .]

The purpose of the new committee structure, which is based on a number of task groups, is to provide a flexible and effective means of surveying continually all of the major problems of research libraries, both individually and in relationship to each other, in order to provide a proper framework for study and action. The objective is to introduce some order into our committee structure. The development of committees has been a rather hit-and-miss affair. They often were organized on an ad hoc basis to meet a specific problem or a particular emergency. We hope that the new approach would bring the element of planning to the committees of the ARL and would obviate a "firehouse approach" to the problems which face us.

In theory these objectives are sound, but they raise a number of questions. For example, can a voluntary organization attack the whole range of complicated problems which face us? Where will the manpower come from? Does the ARL really have a capability for collective action, which includes both the formulation and implementation of solutions to our difficulties?

The proposal before us brings into focus a number of alternative actions which the ARL might take with regard to its objectives and its resources. This new committee structure clearly calls for greater involvement of the membership in the affairs of the ARL. If this is not achieved two alternative courses of action are immediately evident.

The first is to expand the staff of the ARL office in Washington. This would mean more money, either from membership dues or from outside agencies such as foundations, perhaps from both.

The second alternative is to restrict the activities of the Association to only the most critical problems facing research libraries and reject all those programs and activities in which we are now engaged which could not pass this test. The discussion of this new committee structure and the final action on the proposal by the board and the entire membership will shape the future of the Association for a long time to come.

Mr. Hamlin: The proposal impresses me very much. I assume that the new task groups and their committees will have the flexibility needed to handle problems as they arise. For example, the need for the Chinese and Slavic Centers may disappear over the years and new programs may be needed. I assume that this new structure had this in mind.

Mr. Buckman: It most certainly did. At this point, I must pose a question which is crucial to the success of the proposed organization. Would you, as representatives of the member libraries of the Association, be willing to serve as chairmen of these task groups? Would you be able to make the commitment of time and effort called for? An affirmative answer is mandatory if this committee structure is to be implemented. We cannot continue to add new responsibilities to our small staff in Washington. If we are to expand our interests and activities we shall need greater membership involvement.

Mr. Byrd (Indiana): In general, I agree with the proposal to establish the task groups. If we are not concerned about the problems of research libraries, no one will be. We are in the best position to bring forth solutions to those problems. Consequently, I think that each representative of a member library should be willing to devote a certain percentage of his time to what I call "library statesmanship."

Mr. McAnally: The University of Oklahoma Library has been a member of the Association for about ten years. During that time I have not served on many committees but those on which I did serve were active. They had a job to do and tried to get it done. I found this work interesting and stimulating. What concerns me about the proposed structure is that it may result in the establishment of standing committees which might have very little to do. At present, once a committee's charge is fulfilled it goes out of existence.

I should like to see this procedure followed because there is nothing worse than being a member of a committee which does nothing. An inactive committee is worse then no committee at all.

Mr. Buckman: I'm sure the Executive Committee would agree with you. The report is supposed to imply that the chairmen of the task groups and the board of directors would review continually the activities or the lack of them of the committees. In so doing we would be giving some thought to all

of the significant problems that we face and their relationship to one another. We hope to develop a fairly constant conceptual approach to these problems. There is no doubt that the committees, as a result, would have very specific charges and would not remain inactive for long.

Mr. Blackburn: I have a question relating to the proposed Task Group on Association Affairs. It is charged with taking action in consultation with the executive director on any matter between meetings of the board of directors. In these instances it would be acting as the board. Would it be possible to clearly draw a line between the responsibilities of this group and those of the board?

Mr. Buckman: I agree that this task group is not as clearly defined as it should be. Actually, it is the Executive Committee of the board, i.e., the officers of the Association, which is responsible to the board. This year the committee has met twice, has taken some actions and reported them to the board. This procedure was done to expedite the work of the Association and to reduce the number of topics which the board must consider at its meetings. I believe this procedure is working out well.

Mr. Bryant: Is it really necessary to designate the Executive Committee as a special task group? It could lead to confusion since it does not stand in the same relationship to the board and the membership as do the other task groups.

Mr. Buckman: This question has been raised before and has merit. The Task Group on Association Affairs could easily be designated the Executive Committee of the ARL.

Mr. Heron: Speaking as a perplexed member of the executive board of the American Library Association, I would like to second Arthur McAnally's feeling of apprehension about the standing committee syndrome. It has had a disastrous effect on the ALA. This Association doesn't face some of the hazards in the ALA which have brought this about. But I believe there should be emphasis in the final document on the committee structure upon the estab lishment of ad hoc committees. This would be consistent with the task group concept.

Mr. Buckman: You are right in thinking that we should be more specific on that point in the report. It certainly is the intention of this document th we would have a ruthless ferreting out of inactive committees.

Perhaps, I could use Mr. Locke's technique and ask for a show of hands from those who generally favor the idea of this new committee structure. Would those opposing it now raise their hands. There seems to be a clear consensus in favor of it.

In view of this overwhelming support, we shall begin implementation of this structure as quickly as possible.

* * * * *

Associate Executive Director's Report

Mr. Martin: We have had a very useful meeting, but it has been a long one. I shall take just a few minutes to comment on several items of interest.

All members of the Association should have received by now a copy of the amicus brief which the ARL submitted in support of the government in the Williams and Wilkins case. The brief was prepared by Mr. Philip Brown and his staff. The reactions to it lead us to believe that the Association has supported the preparation of a very significant legal document in the area of copyright. The executive secretary of the Association of American Law Schools was so impressed by it that he asked to have it reprinted and distributed widely. We have agreed to this. Each member of the ARL also will receive a copy of the amicus brief by the American Library Association, which is now at the printer's. Mr. Brown is of the opinion that it also is an excellent document. Now we must hope that the commissioner and the judges read them carefully.

The situation in the case is as follows: The defendant, in this case the government, will file its brief by the end of May. The plaintiff, Williams and Wilkins, then is afforded time to reply to the government. The case record is then closed. The commissioner will take an indeterminate amount of time to submit his findings to the court. The court than takes an indeterminate amount of time to issue its ruling. The ruling, of course, can be appealed all the way to the Supreme Court. Mr. Brown is certain that we will not have any decision in this matter by the end of 1971. We may have a ruling in 1972, or it may come in 1973. At times it appears the wheels of justice grind hardly at all.

With respect to matters legislative, Dr. McCarthy's report in January was very complete and things have changed very little since then. Obviously, there will be no new bill on higher education by July 1, but there is a chance that the Office of Education will have its budget approved shortly after July 1. That will be real progress.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is as yet not a reality. We know that the names of the proposed members of the Commission are before the President. We should have an announcement within two weeks.

As all of you know, the office is very careful about recommending questionnaires to the membership. We send enough to you and don't need any outside help. Without twisting anyone's arm, however, we should like to call the attention of the membership to the work of Mr. Harold Young, a doctoral student at the University of Michigan. He is attempting to develop a thesis topic on the

extent of the use of the planning-programming-budgeting system in ARL libraries and its effectiveness. We are not sure that such a thesis can be developed, but that does remain to be seen. Mr. Young is an intelligent and eager young man and his research could be of value to the membership. Several weeks ago he visited with Dr. McCarthy, Duane Webster and myself and discussed his topic and his questionnaire. His intent is to mail the questionnaire to the university library members of the Association. I can say that it meets all of Dr. McCarthy's criteria for a questionnaire which should be answered: it is concise; it is clear; and it can be answered by the director of libraries without getting up from his desk. If the membership can assist Mr. Young, the office would appreciate it.

I don't think it is necessary at this time to give you a progress report on all of the projects of the Association and on all of the activities of the committees. We shall continue to keep you informed through the Newsletter about significant new undertakings and the progress of old ones. If we are successful the report of the executive director at these meetings need not be as long as it has been in the past.

A quick comment on our publication efforts. They have caused some headaches as we have tried to learn about publishing practices and printers' methods. In spite of these difficulties the report from Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Problems in University Library Management, and Keyes Metcalf's Library Lighting have proved to be very successful. Both have undergone a second printing and we are still receiving orders. There is no doubt that publication activities place a severe strain on the limited staff of the office. There is also no doubt, however, that in undertaking them we serve not only the Association but the general library community.

Before resuming my seat, I must thank Thomas Buckman on behalf of the entire membership for this very successful meeting. It was he who developed the theme, secured the speakers, developed the program and negotiated with the Broadmoor. We are in his debt. As you know, Mr. Buckman will give up his duties at Northwestern and as president of the ARL in the near future to be come the new president of the Foundation Center in New York City. We regret his early departure, but we are thankful for his short reign which has produced notable benefits for the Association. We wish him well.

* * * * *

President's Report

Mr. Buckman: Before giving you my report I should correct the impression that this meeting was a one-man operation. The other members of the Program Committee, John McDonald and Jim Haas, provided many useful suggestions. I also consulted with the board of directors, other representatives of ARL members and certain individuals outside the Association. I did have a great deal of help.

The president's report will be brief. It has been customary in the past to review the on-going activities of the ARL. But rather than follow custom, I wish to reflect a bit on the office of the president of the Association.

During his short term, the president has the opportunity to concentrate on a few broad areas of concern in the hope of furthering the aims of the Association. In so doing, he is guided by the deliberations of the board and the

decisions of the membership. He is mindful that there should be continuity of development and he thus builds on the work of his predecessors and attempts to influence events in such a way that he will pass on something useful to his successors.

It has been my privilege to identify two such opportunities in my work during the past months. The first opportunity was to experiment with the form and content of the membership meetings; the second was to work out the proposed new structure for the committees of the Association. The results of my activities in these areas are before you in the success, or lack of it, of this meeting and in the document on the committee structure which we have reviewed and acted upon.

This meeting and the new committee structure address themselves to the range of problems facing research libraries and to the organization of the Association which will enable us to attack them effectively. It is certainly my wish that the membership and the board of directors give their most critical attention to the new committee structure and that they will freely discard elements which are found not to be useful.

Further, I should like to say that any new president of the Association soon is initiated into the day-to-day operation of our Washington office, and becomes aware of the heavy schedule and numerous responsibilities of the staff. These responsibilities are very ably discharged because of the fine leadership of Stephan McCarthy with the assistance of Louis Martin. It has been a great satisfaction for me to work with them, with the board and with all of you here during this past year and during my ten years as a representative of an ARL member library. Thank you and continued good fortune.

My last comment is the traditional announcement of the next meeting of the Association. It will be held at the Palmer House in Chicago on January 22, 1972.

The 78th Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries stands adjourned

* * * * *

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION OF THE ARL MANAGEMENT STUDIES PROGRAM: OBJECTIVES, PROCEDURES AND PRODUCTS

Moderator: Warren J. Haas

Discussants: Earl Bolton, Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc.; Duane Webster, Office of University Library Management Studies

The discussion groups covering the ARL Management Studies Program provided a vigorous dialogue among concerned ARL representatives and several of the principals working closely with the program.

Mr. Haas explained briefly the evolution of the Management Office and the progress of the Columbia project.

Earl Bolton, representing Booz, Allen and Hamilton, the principal investigators on the Columbia project, reviewed the restraints involved in creating the Management Office and directing its future to the maximum benefit of ARL libraries.

Duane Webster, director of the office, emphasized the need to capitalize on the Columbia experience in defining the role of the office and selecting future projects. The discussion that followed provided an exchange of ideas on the appropriate roles for the ARL Management Studies Office, on management issues that require national attention and methods of achieveing required results.

1. Appropriate Roles for the ARL Management Studies Office

There appeared to be general agreement that the mission of the office is to stimulate innovation and improvement in library management. With limited financial and staff resources activities must draw on and amplify the accomplishments of and expertise available in member libraries. To do this, several roles were suggested.

a) Research Role. In several areas, such as the development of standard times and the application of PPBS, there is a need for detailed studies. Librarians need more information concerning the potential and problems of these and other management tools.

b) Communication Role. After identifying problems of common interest, the office could collect information on what is happening in the field. This material needs to be summarized, evaluated, and distributed to the member libraries via newsletters or possibly special manuals. The office could then act as a clearinghouse for information on specific issues, management activities and research projects.

c) Instructional Role. As library directors adopt new approaches or encounter problems that need unfamiliar tools, there is an associated instructional requirement for the middle management of libraries. This

training need is not presently met by the professional associations, schools or commercial firms. The office could meet this need by conducting seminars and training sessions, providing package programs, or employing outside specialists.

d) Consulting or Advisory Role. Some member libraries are looking to the ARL for direct assistance in solving unique local problems. Although characterized as a "fire fighting" approach, several discussants felt that a significant and very desirable service could be offered, possibly with an appropriate fee.

2. Management Issues

a) The topic of budgeting systems and techniques generated the most interest in both discussion sessions. Faced with pressures for retrenchment and demands for new approaches to justifying the costs of libraries, the discussants wanted more information on the techniques available and guidelines for their use.

b) A variety of staffing issues were raised concerning the role of the professional in large, complex library organizations. They included: objectives of and procedures for performance reviews; availability of alternate career ladders; requirements of peer evaluation; development of unions and other strong staff organizations; costs of continued staff expansion; and elaboration of salary benefits.

c) Utilization of group efforts to improve library performance was mentioned in both sessions as a topic that will require more attention by library directors. Aspects of group management that were mentioned included: participative management techniques; internal communication systems; organizational behavior; and the sociology of change and development.

d) The need for standard measurements was mentioned as a means of evaluating performance and anticipating costs of new programs. Although useful, there was some feeling that standardized norms need more development before their application is warranted.

e) The organization and structure of the library as it relates to the university received some attention in the second session. Concern was expressed because some universities are grouping libraries outside the strict academic circle. Forms of internal organization were also mentioned. Some libraries are experimenting with new program oriented and collegiate forms of organization. Centralization vs decentralization of library operations was also discussed.

f) The topic of causing and controlling change in library organization was mentioned.

3. Methods

A variety of activities were suggested to implement the various roles prescribed for the office.

APPENDIX A

Research Role:

- Investigate available strategic and long-range planning programs, such as that of the American Management Association, and adapt them to academic library purposes.
- Develop analytical and quantitative tools and techniques that may be used by individual libraries to solve their management problems.
- Devise simulated operational models that could be used as needed.
- Prepare a self-analysis manual that would generalize the methodology used in the Columbia study and facilitate investigation of an individual library's organizational problems.
- Develop a system of standard measurements for essential library activities.
- Solicit and sponsor research projects on the management of university libraries.

Communication Role:

- Visit university libraries engaged in important management projects.
- Act as an information clearinghouse, drawing on academic, business, and other professional sources.
- Publish monographs and journal articles on management.
- Provide a library of management documents both published and unpublished.

Instructional Role:

- Design and operate a seminar series.
- Provide training sessions for middle management of libraries.
- Travel to individual libraries to conduct specialized training programs.

Consulting Role:

- Provide a cadre of consultants who would travel to universities requesting assistance.
- Develop management services that could be sold to individual libraries.

Duane Webster

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Moderator: David Kaser

Discussant: Peter Hiatt, Director, Continuing Education Program for Library Personnel, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Mr. Hiatt reviewed recent research and experimantation in staff development. He also stated the case for the essential role of management in staff development and discussed the problems involved in implementing an effective program. Strengths and weaknesses of most present efforts were explained and possible solutions to some of them were proposed. Among the weaknesses enumerated were the following:

1) the ineligibility of libraries, as distinct from library schools, for institute funding under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act;

2) the unwillingness of the Office of Education to fund an institute a second time;

3) the fact that most programs are designed to meet needs as perceived by library managers rather than by librarians; and

4) most existing efforts toward staff development lack both continuity and follow-up.

Mr. Hiatt explained some of the efforts now being made by the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education to develop programs which would overcome these weaknesses.

There was vigorous discussion of the topics raised by Mr. Hiatt. Much of it centered upon his observation that an element of major importance in any effective program of staff development is an extensive sharing with the staff of responsibility for management decisions. Only through such participation can the staff come to know how to make effective decisions and possess a meaningful sense of self-actualization, which is important to professional fulfillment. Problems of eliciting and maintaining widespread staff participation were also discussed. Finally, the question of the appropriate role of the Association of Research Libraries in staff development was raised. There was a general consensus that the ARL should engage in this effort. The recent study by Booz, Allen and Hamilton had already identified organization and staffing as key target areas for research by the Office of University Library Management Studies. It was thought that this office might, therefore, prove to be the best vehicle for disseminating information on staff development to the membership of the Association. There was enthusiasm for the idea that the Management Studies Office should sponsor a series of regional seminars on the topic. The participating libraries would help to underwrite the cost of these seminars. The moderator assured the audience that this matter would be brought to Mr. Webster's attention.

David Kaser

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION OF THE ARL INTERLIBRARY LOAN STUDY AND OF LIBRARY NETWORKS

Moderator: Arthur McAnally

Discussants: Arthur McAnally and James V. Jones

Mr. McAnally distributed copies of a progress report on the interlibrary loan cost study prepared by the principal investigator, Westat, Inc. He recalled the long history of interlibrary lending, its constant growth and increasing cost, and the growing problem of imbalance which results in the greatest burden falling upon a few large libraries at a time when there is a general constriction of library funding. Mr. McAnally pointed out that there were 800,000 interlibrary loan transactions in 1963-64, whereas there were over 2,000,000 in 1967-68. He estimated that there has been a growth rate of 15 percent since then. Mr. McAnally reported that cost estimates for an interlibrary loan transaction ranged from two dollars to eleven dollars. With regard to the imbalance and increasing costs, he cited Miss Thompson's findings that only 165 university libraries accounted for 80 percent of the interlibrary loan transactions among academic libraries, and that one large library discovered that it has been spending over $250,000 per year on interlibrary lending.

In view of these facts, it was clear to the Interlibrary Loan Committee of the ARL that the most useful point of departure in dealing with these problems was to discover the magnitude, characteristics and costs of the interlibrary lending activity. These could best be derived from a study focusing upon those institutions doing substantial lending. The National Science Foundation provided financial support for this study, which is being administered by the ARL and carried on by Westat, Inc.

The question was raised as to the utility of the final report, which will be available in the fall of 1971. Mr. McAnally suggested that it might have a number of results: an equitable system of reimbursing those libraries which lend the most, a reexamination of the concept of general self-sufficiency in research library collections; development of more effective coordination of resources based on sound regional and national planning; and adequate financial support. Mr. McAnally was skeptical that machine technology would provide any quick solutions to the problems of effective interlibrary lending.

Mr. Jones introduced the subject of library networks by reviewing the remarks of Mr. Joseph Jeffs and Mr. John McDonald on the previous afternoon. He noted that networks have a long history since interlibrary lending and union catalogs represent important components of them. He also noted, however, that library networks are becoming more common and more sophisticated and cited the Ohio College Library Center as an example of this development.

Mr. Jones emphasized the importance of bibliographic control of the resources of any network through regional and national union catalogs. He favors emphasizing the location of resources rather then their physical consolidation. If a title can be located, it normally can be obtained for the user.

Mr. Jones posed the question as to whether or not the ARL should establish its own network of research libraries.

Many questions and comments followed Mr. Jones' presentation. Among the subjects discussed were the following:

1. The proportion of photocopying to lending and whether liberalized copying practices (and the consequent restrictions of the loan of volumes of journals) would increase that proportion.

2. The granting of state and federal funds to compensate research libraries for loan and copying transactions, such as is done in New York State, and new bases for making such awards. Mr. Fry of the Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology reported that LSDA Title III funds, though limited, no longer carry matching requirements, but that states are expected to finance state systems in time.

3. Calculating the cost of incomplete interlibrary loan requests (with reference to the value of union catalogs). This topic will be covered by the Westat study.

4. Deciding the optimum size for networks. It was suggested that a network of the ARL members would be too limited.

5. The role of the federal government. It was agreed that the federal government has a very important role to play in meeting the cost of networks and of coordination of access to resources. It was suggested that this role be recommended as a high priority to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

D. W. Heron

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAM

FOR ACQUISITIONS AND CATALOGING

Moderator: James E. Skipper

Discussant: Edmond L. Applebaum, Library of Congress

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC) was discussed as one of several programs, including the Farmington Plan and PL 480, involved with the collection and distribution of bibliographic information in the national interest.

Mr. Edmond Applebaum, assistant director for acquisitions and overseas operations of the Library of Congress, reviewed briefly the development of the NPAC which today, along with PL 480, provides comprehensive coverage of scholarly publications in forty-seven countries. He explained that it was thought that worldwide coverage by the program would be accomplished with 250,000 titles per year. Because of increased publication activity, however, this figure has been revised upward to 450,000 titles.

The executive branch of the federal government has directed that funding for the program be made part of the regular budget of the Library of Congress. Mrs. Greene, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, is insisting that the program remain as a part of higher education legislation, with funding going directly to the Library of Congress rather than through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This impasse must be resolved within the next several months.

Mr. Applebaum asked the audience which countries or areas should be given priority for coverage by the program. There was general agreement that Spain and Latin America, in that order should be the next targets.

Mr. Applebaum stated that the member libraries of the ARL should be receiving cataloging copy for about 70 percent of the titles they catalog each year, if books are held for a period of three months after receipt. Seventy-five percent coverage should be obtained if libraries are willing to hold their books for six months. Some libraries, such as North Carolina and MIT, are obtaining 90 percent coverage now.

The Library of Congress has found increasing support for arranging the depository cards by title rather than by main entry. Respondents are now almost divided. Mr. Orne reported that title arrangement at North Carolina increased the yield of the depository file by 10 percent. Further, searching under title can be done by less expensive personnel then would be the case if the search had to be made under main entry.

APPENDIX D

Since the beginning of the NPAC, distribution of costs has been approximately as follows: 15 percent for acquisitions; 70 percent for cataloging; 9 percent for card publication and distribution; and 6 percent for administrative costs.

Mr. Metcalf asked about the possibility of the NPAC providing a second national loan copy of titles purchased under the program for selected areas of the world. Amendments to Title II-C of the Higher Education Act make provision for the acquisition of a second loan copy, but funding has been inadequate to implement this part of the program.

There was some discussion of the relationship of the Farmington Plan to the NPAC. There was some concern that the programs were duplicative in certain respects and there was a suggestion that the Farmington Plan may have outlived its usefulness. Mr. Branscomb moved that the board of directors of the Association should authorize a study of this situation. Mr. Branscomb's motion was seconded by Mr. Dix.

James E. Skipper

APPENDIX E

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE ARL MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

The Membership Committee met at ARL headquarters in Washington, D. C. on Friday, April 23. Present, in addition to committee members Arthur T. Hamlin and William N. Locke, were President Thomas R. Buckman, Past President Warren J. Haas, Executive Director Stephen A. McCarthy, President-Elect John P. McDonald and Associate Executive Director Louis E. Martin. Committee member John H. Gribbin was absent.

During our meeting in Los Angeles, it was decided that the names of the individuals serving on the Membership Committee should be made public, and that specific criteria for membership in the ARL should be developed and also made public. In the spirit of those decisions, the committee now comes to the members with a number of recommendations. These are for implementation of the guidelines in the bylaws, as amended at Los Angeles. We do not recommend that detailed criteria for membership be incorporated in the bylaws, but some changes will need to be made if our recommendations are followed.

Since the size and constitution of the membership determine what sort of an organization the ARL is to be, the criteria for membership are of major importance. For this reason the first recommendation of the committee is that the criteria for membership be voted by the members.

Perhaps the best way to start selecting criteria for membership is by asking "What is a research library?" One answer might be derived from a description of the present membership. It is composed of large, general research libraries belonging to nonprofit institutions, 78 out of a total of 89 to universities. The ARL Statistics provide a factual description of the academic members. The nonuniversity libraries are quite different; so it was decided to confine this report to university libraries. Identification of possible criteria for nonuniversity members is recommended as a committee goal for next year.

Since ARL Statistics serve in a sense to evaluate members, the same statistics can also serve, at least in part, to evaluate candidates for membership. To bring the ARL Statistics in line with what we request from candidates, we feel that it would be desirable to ask members to report each year on currently received serial and journal titles (carefully defined) and on doctorates awarded by the university, both the total and the number awarded in specified disciplines. (A tentative list of broad subject fields is attached to this report.) We would propose to ask candidates to give the average of their doctorate figures over the past three years in order to smooth the curve.

Our second recommendation--which has been accepted as feasible by the executive director--is that ARL Statistics be expanded to include figures on current serial and journal titles, on number of doctorates awarded in certain broad fields, and on total number of doctorates awarded.

In the past, the Membership Committee and the board of directors have used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative criteria for the selection of new members. In order to make the process less subject to criticism, our third recommendation is that the criteria for selection be quantitative.

The fourth recommendation, to simplify the admission process and make it fairer, is that admission to ARL be automatic for any university library which meets the criteria. Under this policy, we would expect those interested to apply. After checking their figures with the criteria, the executive director would report to the board of directors, proceeding under Article II, Section 1, of the bylaws.

It is recognized that there may be convincing reasons for admitting to membership certain university libraries which do not meet the criteria. In fact, some present members may not meet any set of criteria which we adopt. Our fifth recommendation, therefore, is that in exceptional cases ARL should feel free to admit university libraries not meeting the criteria.

The sixth and final recommendation of the committee is that the following be the criteria for admission to membership in ARL:

1.	Volumes in Library	750,000
2.	Volumes added	40,000
3.	Professional staff, F.T.E.	35
4.	Total staff, F.T.E.	100
5.	Materials and binding	$500,000
6.	Salaries and wages	$750,000
7.	Total operating expense	$1,350,000
8.	Current serial and journal titles	10,000
9.	Total doctorates awarded	150*
10.	Doctorates awarded in broad fields	5/10**

*Average of 150/year over a 3-year period.
**On the average, over a 3-year period, doctorates awarded in five of the ten broad subject fields.

APPENDIX E

Population growth is continual and will probably be reflected in a continuing growth of higher education. It is interesting to note that the number of doctorates granted by universities in the United States increased by 350 percent between 1950 and 1970; the membership of the ARL grew by 90 percent during the same period. This might indicate that some further growth of ARL may be justified. In fact, any fixed set of criteria will probably result in a gradual increase in the size of ARL.

William N. Locke, chairman
John H. Gribbin
Arthur T. Hamlin

May 14, 1971

Ten Broad Subject Fields, with Subfields, of Doctorates Awarded in the U.S.*

I. ARTS and HUMANITIES
- Fine Arts
- History
- Language
- Literature
- Music
- Other Arts and Humanities

II. BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

III. EDUCATION

IV. ENGINEERING

V. LAW

VI. LIBRARY and INFORMATION SCIENCE

VII. MEDICINE

VIII. RELIGION and THEOLOGY

IX. SCIENCE
- Agriculture
- Astronomy
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Earth Sciences
- Forestry
- Health Sciences (except Medicine)
- Mathematics
- Physics
- Other Biological Sciences

X. SOCIAL SCIENCES
- Anthropology
- Archaeology
- Economics
- Home Economics
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Other Social Sciences

*Adapted from Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities, 1958-1966, National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council, Washington, D. C., 1967, p. 59.

APPENDIX F

DRAFT

A NEW COMMITTEE STRUCTURE FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

The Association of Research Libraries has as its primary function the identification and solution of the fundamental problems of large research libraries, to the end that they may effectively serve the needs of students, faculty, and others in universities and the research community generally.

In carrying out this function, the Association must focus on key objectives, set priorities, and take appropriate action on a wide range of matters. In the future, the individual libraries and the Association will have to find ways of embarking on new and extensive collective forms of action, usually on a national basis, which will provide many kinds of required resources and services at acceptable costs. It is essential, therefore, that the committee structure of the Association reflect this intention.

The purpose of the new committee structure, which is based on a number of task groups, is to provide a flexible and effective means of surveying continually all of the major problems of research libraries, individually and in relationship to each other, in order to provide a framework for integrated study, review, and action. It is not intended that the task groups seek out "jobs" in order to justify their existence, but rather that they should address themselves to existing areas of substantial concern, divide them into manageable parts, and accept responsibility for appropriate ARL activity in the respective areas, with the concurrence of the board and the members.

The three basic elements of the committee structure are: 1) the board of directors, responsible for broad review and coordination and for determining and initiating appropriate action by the Association, as well as for the monitoring of results; 2) six or more task groups, each of which is responsible for the definition of problems, setting objectives and priorities, and for effective committee structure and action within wide but delimited areas of concern; and 3) committees within each of these areas, devoted to study and recommendations with respect to more specific problems or related groups of problems.

The board and the task group chairmen will devise a coherent and workable pattern of committee assignments under each task group, but the work of one group will necessarily relate to and influence the work of others; this must continually be taken into account in the planning of the task groups and the work of the committees. Means of reaching effective plans of action should, of course, take precedence over procedural or jurisdictional considerations.

APPENDIX F

Task group chairmen should require periodic reports in writing from their committees, and, in turn, they should report regularly to the board, coordinating, as appropriate, the reports of related committees within their groups. The board will perform a similar function when it considers reports from the task groups. The task groups may be asked to maintain liaison with committees appointed to advise operating programs, such as the Chinese and Slavic Centers, or with joint committees. The task group chairman or another member of the task group may sit as an observer on such committees with the approval of the board.

Initially, the existing committees of the Association will be assigned to an appropriate task group. The task group chairmen will then review and recommend restructuring of committees as necessary. It shall be the objective of the Association to involve as many ARL representatives as possible in committee work.

Each task group will consist of three members, one of which shall be a member of the board. All members of the task group shall be ARL representatives. They shall be appointed for three-year, staggered terms by the president and the board.

The board shall meet regularly with the task group chairmen to discuss the objectives and work of the task groups and their committees. Likewise, the task group chairmen shall meet regularly with their committee chairmen and, on occasion, with the committees, themselves, for the same purposes.

Attached is a tentative list of task groups, their charges and committees.

Thomas R. Buckman

March 29, 1971

APPENDIX F

TENTATIVE LIST OF TASK GROUPS, CHARGES AND RELATED COMMITTEES

1. Task Group on the Development of Resources

Charge: To strengthen, by appropriate and effective means, the collections of research libraries, building wherever possible on existing cooperative programs involving divided responsibility for collection development.

Committees:
Copying Manuscripts and Unpublished Materials
Foreign Acquisitions
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm
Microfilming Dissertations
Preservation
Center for Chinese Research Materials (liaison)
Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center (liaison)

Other areas of concern:
Book preservation center
Federal information resources
National periodicals center
National collection of microforms with lending capability
Research libraries and the commercial sector

2. Task Group on the Organization of Resources

Charge: To seek means of improving and extending bibliographic control of research library materials, including methods of ordering and processing these materials to ensure the greatest compatibility of form, economy of staff effort and institutional expenditures, and usefulness to readers.

Committees:
Non-GPO Publications
Shared Cataloging
National Serials Data Program (liaison)

Other areas of concern:
Processing center for data in machine-readable form
National bibliographic center

3. Task Group on Access to Resources and Service to Readers

Charge: To assist the researcher and scholar by improving knowledge about and access to research libraries, singly and collectively.

Committees: Availability of Resources
Interlibrary Loan Study (liaison)
Microform Project (liaison)

Other areas of concern:
Centers (subject, geographical, etc.) for identifying and locating information
Cooperative access arrangements among libraries
A national lending library of books received through NPAC
Studies of the economics of information, involving fee systems, the publication process, etc.
Subject-based information centers for the sciences
Technology linking an individual to required resources

4. Task Group on Management of Research Libraries

Charge: To identify, study and seek solutions to the basic management problems of research libraries, utilizing the capability of the ARL Office of University Library Management Studies and the work of the ARL/ACE Committee on University Library Management.

Committees: Library Security
Standards
Training for Research Librarianship
University Library Management (liaison with the committee and Management Office)
University Library Standards (liaison)

Other areas of concern:
Automation
Staff participation in management
Relationships and consultations with users of research libraries
Status of academic librarians

5. Task Group on Relationships with the Federal Government

Charge: To study the legislative, administrative and judicial policies and trends within the federal government as they may relate to the interests and objectives of research libraries; and to bring these interests and objectives to the attention of the Congress, federal agencies and persons representing them in ways which will engage their support of the national community of research libraries serving higher education, government and society at large. (This task group will ordinarily be concerned with broad issues and programs of interest to all of the other task groups; more specific relationships with federal agencies

which can be resolved by administrative agreements may generally be handled directly by the other groups or their committees, with the approval of the board or the officers.)

Committees: Federal Relations
Copyright

Other areas of concern: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

6. Task Group on Association Affairs (Executive Committee composed of officers of the ARL)

Charge: To take action, in consultation with the executive director and in conformity with the bylaws, on any matter coming before the Association between meetings of the board of directors, such actions to be reported to the board for review;

To study the internal structure and operation of the Association and to make recommendations to the board and the executive director for increasing the effectiveness of the Association.

Committees: Membership
Negro Academic Libraries
Nominating
Program
Publications

Other areas of concern: ARL Washington Office (consultative and advisory function)
Relationships of the ARL to other components of the information community
Relationships of the ARL to appropriate international organizations

APPENDIX G

REPORT OF THE ARL COMMITTEE ON NON-GPO PUBLICATIONS

The ARL Committee on Non-GPO Publications held a meeting at the Library of Congress on March 30, 1971, with an announced agenda of two topics. The meeting enjoyed the hospitality of Mr. William Welsh's conference table and had very broad participation by Library of Congress staff principals concerned with various aspects of document handling. Library of Congress participants were: Edmond Applebaum, Nathan Einhorn, Robert Holmes, Sumner Spalding and William Welsh. All committee members were present: William Budington, Edward DiRoma, Benjamin Powell, Clifton Brock and Jerrold Orne.

The first item on the agenda was the progress in non-GPO document availability since our last meeting. Nathan Einhorn spoke to this point. There has been a considerably increased flow of non-GPO documents into the L.C., directly attributable to the release of the Bureau of the Budget directive. An initial selection is made of the non-GPO documents received in the Library and those judged to merit listing by the Superintendent of Documents are forwarded for his review. Of 2,243 documents selected by L.C. in nine months of 1970, 2,093 were announced in the Monthly Catalog, approximately 93 percent. There were 132 duplicates and 18 were rejected as candidates for listing. Library of Congress personnel feel that the effect of the Bureau of the Budget instruction to federal agencies concerning routing of publications to L.C. has been a considerable gain in input. They also are convinced that nothing short of a full campaign will always be required to maintain this level of yield.

The first issue of the new publication, Non-GPO Imprints, appeared in 1970. It listed 1,112 monographs and 212 periodicals, all issued in 1967 through 1969. The second issue, covering 1970 publications--255 monographs and 137 periodicals--will appear shortly. This new service of the L.C. is not considered an extremely popular tool, inasmuch as only those publications rejected by the Superintendent of Documents may be included in the L.C. publication. If the selection of items referred to the Superintendent of Documents is good, what remains for the L.C. publication will be relatively less useful. It is clear that the L.C. and the committee believe the new publication to be useful, though to a limited degree. As an occasional publication, it will supplement presently available bibliographic tools.

Following a general discussion on the progress in the L.C. and the work of the Superintendent of Documents, the committee concluded that there is no real purpose in continuing as a committee. There is no additional pressure that can be brought beyond that derived from the Bureau of the Budget circular and the cooperation between the L.C. and the Superintendent of Documents. It would, therefore, be our recommendation that this ARL committee be discharged.

APPENDIX G

The second topic which was taken up by the committee, and in which the L.C. personnel also participated, was consideration of the proposed study project on the use, bibliographic control and distribution of federal, state and local government publications. This project was designed at the University of Indiana Library School and presented in a report to the Office of Education as the result of a contract by that agency. The report envisions funding of $340,000 for a period of twenty-one months to accomplish the above task.

After prolonged discussion, there appeared to be a consensus that the proposed study is far too extensive and diffuse to have any possibility of achieving a useful conclusion. It was agreed by all that we need to know a great deal more about each of the questions raised, but it is our enduring conviction that there are far too many questions to answer in the proposed scope of the study. From our point of view, it seems appropriate to suggest that a thoroughgoing concentration on federal documents is apt to be most productive for the research libraries in this country. The state documents certainly require rationalizing for bibliographic control and distribution. This is, and it should be, essentially the responsibility of the Association of State Library Agencies and they should be urged to make it their own prime research project. Municipal documents, while they have similar problems, are essentially of local interest and should be organized locally. In fact, it is hard to see how anyone can influence this local organization on a national scale. All of this brings us back to our recommendation that federal documents must be the focus of any documents project.

Investigating the use, bibliographic control and distribution also leads to the same conclusion. Use of documents as a form of publication will, we believe, point immediately to the importance of federal documents way beyond any other type. Bibliographic control is a national problem. Where, in fact, it is a state function, it can only be done within the state and must begin there. Distribution of state publications is, in microcosm, only a smaller variant of federal distribution. On an even more modest basis is the distribution of local government publications. The critical problem then, so far as the study project is concerned, is how to narrow the field and to make it effective.

Some members of the committee suggested that a library school oriented project is not the most effective way of accomplishing the above objective. It seems to us that the sponsorship of any project concerned with control and distribution of federal documents can only be useful and effective if it lies in an operating agency directly related to the potential users. Only such an agency could be influential in promoting the effective use of the data developed. Further, the cooperation of all of the concerned libraries can best be obtained through their own representative organization. It would appear that a project for a concentrated study of federal documents should be designed, directed and administered within the ARL. This is where the concentration of users lies and this is where the survey field is predominantly represented.

APPENDIX G

To summarize the view of the committee, we recommend strongly against any formal endorsement of the project as presented. We speak to the urgency of work in this area being more specifically directed and more closely tied to the requirements of the research libraries of this country.

Jerrold Orne, chairman
Clifton Brock
William Budington
Edward DiRoma
Benjamin Powell

April 16, 1971

APPENDIX H

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

COMMITTEES

1971

Availability of Resources

Chairman: Richard Chapin
Warren Boes
David Heron
Ralph Hopp
Arthur McAnally

Copying Manuscripts and Unpublished Materials

Chairman: James Henderson
Roy Basler
William Bond
William Cagle
Verner Clapp
Oliver Holmes

Copyright

Chairman: Verner Clapp

Federal Relations

Chairman: Robert Vosper
Stuart Forth
W. Carl Jackson
Benjamin Powell
Rutherford Rogers
Chairman of Foreign Acquisitions Committee

Foreign Acquisitions

Chairman: Philip McNiff
Vice Chairman: Marion Milczewski
Edmond Applebaum
Lloyd Griffin
James Henderson
Gordon Williams
Chairman of Area Subcommittees:
Louis Jacob (South Asia)
Robert Johnson (Latin America)
David Kaser (Southeast Asia)
Marion Milczewski (Eastern Europe)
Hans Panofsky (Africa)
David Partington (Middle East)
Howard Sullivan (Western Europe)
Warren Tsuneishi (Far East)
Chairman of Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee
Chairman of Shared Cataloging Committee

Library Security

Chairman: Ben Bowman
Kenneth Allen
Myles Slatin

Membership

Chairman: William Locke
John Gribbin
Arthur Hamlin

Microfilming Dissertations

Chairman: Gustave Harrer
Stuart Forth
J. Boyd Page
David Weber

APPENDIX H

Negro Academic Libraries

Chairman: Frank Grisham
Arthur Hamlin
David Kaser

Nominating

Chairman: John McDonald
Douglas Bryant
Arthur Hamlin

Periodicals Resources Center Study

Chairman: Joseph Jeffs
John Berthel
D. F. Finn
Ralph Hopp

Preservation

Chairman: Warren Haas
Robert Blackburn
Douglas Bryant
Verner Clapp
Herman Fussler
James Henderson
L. Quincy Mumford
Rutherford Rogers
Gordon Williams

Recommendations of Federal Information Resources Conference

Chairman: W. Carl Jackson
Hugh Atkinson
John Berthel
Joseph Jeffs

Shared Cataloging

Chairman: David Kaser
Ralph Ellsworth
Edmon Low
John McDonald

Standards

Chairman: Jerrold Orne
Eugene Kennedy
LeRoy Ortopan
Howard Rovelstad
John Sherrod

Training for Research Librarianship

Chairman: David Kaser
Gordon Bechanan
Warren Haas
Warren Kuhn
John McDonald
Raynard Swank

APPENDIX H

Project Advisory Committees

Center for Chinese Research Libraries

Chairman: Philip McNiff
John Israel
Ying-mao Kau
Frederick Mote
Warren Tsuneishi
Eugene Wu

Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project

Chairman: John Lorenz
Gordon Bechanan
Louis Kaplan
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Gordon Williams

Interlibrary Loan Study Committee

Chairman: Arthur McAnally
Gordon Bechanan
David Heron
Sarah Thompson
Gordon Williams

Microform Project

Task I: Bibliographic Control
Principal Investigator: Felix Reichmann
Assistant Principal Investigator: Josephine Tharpe
Samuel Boone
Helen Brown
Lyman Butterfield
Richard DeGennaro
Allen Veaner

Task II: National Microform Agency
Principal Investigator: Edward Miller
Thomas Bagg
John Berthel
Forrest Carhart, Jr.
Donald Holmes
Charles LaHood, Jr.
Carl Nelson

Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center

Chairman: Marion Milczewski
William Edgerton
Richard Pipes
Joseph Placek
Sergius Yakobson

APPENDIX H

Joint Committees

ACRL-ARL Committee on University Library Standards

Chairman: Robert Downs
Clifton Brock
Gustave Harrer
Jay Lucker
Ellsworth Mason
John McDonald
Norman Tanis

ARL-ACE Committee on University Library Management

Chairman: Warren Haas
Willard Boyd, President
University of Iowa
Douglas Bryant
Allan Cartter, Chancellor
New York University
Herman Fussler
Howard Johnson, President
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Richard Lyman, President
Stanford University
John McDonald
Robert Vosper

* * * * *

Representative on Advisory Committee to National Translation Center (Crerar) ..... Joseph Shipman
Representative on Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee ..... Harold Gordon
Representative on Joint Committee on Union List of Serials ..... William Budington
Representatives on COSATI Task Group on Libraries ..... Stephen McCarthy
John Berthel
W. Carl Jackson
Joseph Jeffs
Representatives on Library of Congress Liaison Committee for Librarians ..... ARL President
ARL Vice President
ARL Executive Director
Representative to United States Book Exchange ..... Porter Kellam
Representative on ANSI Committee Z-39 ..... Jerrold Orne
Representative on ANSI Committee Z-85 ..... LeRoy Ortopan

1/2

APPENDIX I

ATTENDANCE AT 78TH MEETING

Members

University of Alabama Library
Joseph A. Jackson

University of Alberta Library
G. G. Turner

University of Arizona Library
Robert K. Johnson

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

Brown University Library
David A. Jonah

University of California Library
(Berkeley) James E. Skipper

University of California Library
(Davis) J. R. Blanchard

University of California Library
(Los Angeles) Robert Vosper

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
James V. Jones

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

University of Chicago Library
Herman H. Fussler

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Bruce Kauffman

University of Colorado Library
Ralph E. Ellsworth

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
David Kaser

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
W. P. Kellam

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

Howard University Libraries
William D. Cunningham

University of Illinois Library
Lucien W. White

Indiana University Libraries
Cecil K. Byrd

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
John H. Berthel

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
David W. Heron

Library of Congress
John Lorenz

Linda Hall Library
Thomas D. Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
T. N. McMullan

University of Maryland Library
Howard Rovelstad

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Merle N. Boylan

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
William N. Locke

University of Michigan Library
Joseph H. Treyz

Michigan State University Library
Richard Chapin

University of Missouri Library
C. Edward Carroll

National Agricultural Library
John Sherrod

National Library of Canada
Lachlan F. MacRae

University of Nebraska Libraries
Frank A. Lundy

New York Public Library
Richard W. Couper

New York University Libraries
Charles F. Gosnell
George W. Stone, Jr.

University of North Carolina Libraries
Jerrold Orne

Northwestern University Libraries
Thomas R. Buckman

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David Sparks

Ohio State University Libraries
Lewis C. Branscomb

University of Oklahoma Library
Arthur M. McAnally

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
Carl W. Hintz

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard DeGennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
W. Carl Jackson

University of Pittsburgh Library
Glenora Edwards Rossell

Princeton University Library
William S. Dix

Purdue University Library
Oliver C. Dunn

Rice University Library
Richard L. O'Keeffe

Rutgers University Library
Virginia P. Whitney

St. Louis University Library
William P. Cole

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Russell Shank

University of Southern California Library
Roy L. Kidman

APPENDIX I

Southern Illinois University Library
Ralph E. McCoy

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Myles Slatin

Syracuse University Library
Warren N. Boes

Temple University Library
Arthur Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
Richard Boss

University of Texas Libraries
Fred Folmer

Texas A&M University Library
Richard Puckett

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert H. Blackburn

Tulane University Library
Charles E. Miller

University of Utah Library
Ralph D. Thomson

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz

University of Washington Library
Marion A. Milczewski

Washington University Libraries
Andrew J. Eaton

Wayne State University Library
Mark M. Gormley

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

ARL Staff:

Louis E. Martin.....Associate Executive Director
Duane E. Webster.....Director, Office of University Library Management Studies

Program Participants:

Edmond L. Applebaum.....Assistant Director for Acquisitions and Overseas Operations, Library of Congress
John H. Berthel.....Librarian, Johns Hopkins University Library
Lewis C. Branscomb.....Director, Ohio State University Libraries
Earl C. Bolton.....Vice President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton
Melvin S. Day.....Director, Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation
Warren J. Haas.....Director, Columbia University Libraries
Neal Harlow.....Consultant to ARL and Federal Relations Committee
Peter Hiatt.....Director, Continuing Education Program for Library Personnel
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder Colorado

APPENDIX I

Joseph E. Jeffs.....Director, Georgetown University Library
James V. Jones.....Director, Case Western Reserve University Library
David Kaser.....Director, Cornell University Libraries
Herman Liebaers.....Director, Royal Library of Belgium and President, International Federation of Library Associations
Richard W. Lyman.....President, Stanford University
Arthur M. McAnally.....Librarian, University of Oklahoma Library
John P. McDonald.....Director, University of Connecticut Library
James E. Skipper.....Librarian, University of California Library, Berkeley
Myles Slatin.....Director, State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Robert Vosper.....Librarian, University of California Library, Los Angeles
Paul G. Zurkowski.....Executive Director, Information Industry Association

Guests:

Fred Cole.....President, Council on Library Resources
Frank K. Cylke.....Executive Secretary, Federal Library Committee
Ray Fry.....Director, Division of Library Programs, U.S. Office of Education
Brigham D. Madsen.....Vice President for Administration, University of Utah
Keyes Metcalf.....Consultant
Foster Mohrhardt.....Council on Library Resources
Joseph H. Reason.....Howard University Library
J.L. Scholfield.....Cambridge University Library of Great Britain
Mrs. N. I. Tyulina.....Director, United Nations Library
Yasumi Yoshitake.....Professor, Engineering Faculty, University of Tokyo

APPENDIX I

ARL Members Not in Attendance:

Boston Public Library

Boston University Library

Duke University Libraries

Florida State University Library

University of Iowa Libraries

Iowa State University Library

University of Kentucky Libraries

McGill University Library

University of Minnesota Libraries

National Library of Medicine

New York State Library

University of Rochester Libraries

Washington State University Library

University of Wisconsin Libraries

APPENDIX J

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

1971

University of Alabama Library
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35486
Joseph A. Jackson, Acting Librarian

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
Robert K. Johnson, Librarian

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver 8, British Columbia, Canada
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
David A. Jonah, Librarian

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Eldred Smith, Acting Librarian

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
J. R. Blanchard, Librarian

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Robert Vosper, Librarian

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director

Center for Research Libraries
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams Director

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
D. Gale Johnson, Acting Director

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Bruce Kauffman, Director

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Ralph E. Ellsworth, Director

Columbia University Libraries
New York, N. Y. 10027
Warren J. Haas, Director

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
David Kaser, Director

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
N. Orwin Rush, Librarian

118

APPENDIX J

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D. C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
W. P. Kellam, Director

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Librarian

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D. C. 20001
William D. Cunningham, Director

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61803
Lucien W. White, Dean of Library Administration

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
Robert A. Miller, Director

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library Administration

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50010
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Library Services

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director

Johns Hopkins University Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
John H. Berthel, Librarian

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
David W. Heron, Director

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40650
Stuart Forth, Director

Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540
L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Joseph C. Shipman, Librarian

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
T. N. McMullan, Director

McGill University Library
Montreal 2, Quebec, Canada
Keith Crouch, Director

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
Howard Rovelstad, Librarian

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003
David Clay, Director

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
William N. Locke, Director

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Frederick H. Wagman, Director

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard Chapin, Librarian

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Ralph H. Hopp, Director

University of Missouri Libraries
Columbia, Missouri 65202
C. Edward Carroll, Director

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
John Sherrod, Director

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa 4, Ontario, Canada
Guy Sylvestre, Librarian

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20203
Martin M. Cummings, Director

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
John W. Heussman, Director

New York Public Library
New York, N. Y. 10018
Richard W. Couper, President

New York State Library
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
John A. Humphry, Assistant
Commissioner for Libraries

New York University Libraries
New York, N. Y. 10003
George W. Stone, Jr., Dean of
Libraries

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
Jerrold Orne, Director

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian

University of Notre Dame Libraries
South Bend, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Hugh Atkinson, Director

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Arthur M. McAnally, Librarian

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
Carl W. Hintz, Dean of Libraries

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard DeGennaro, Director

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
W. Carl Jackson, Director

University of Pittsburgh Library
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
William S. Dix, Librarian

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Oliver C. Dunn, Associate Director

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main
Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Ben Bowman, Director

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Virginia P. Whitney, Librarian

St. Louis University Library
St. Louis, Missouri 63108
William P. Cole, Acting Director

APPENDIX J

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at Tenth St., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20560
Russell Shank, Director

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Ralph E. McCoy, Director

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director

State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Myles Slatin, Director

Syracuse University Library
Syracuse, New York 13210
Warren N. Boes, Director

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Richard Boss, Director

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Fred Folmer, Librarian

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
John B. Smith, Director

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada
Robert H. Blackburn, Chief Librarian

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
John H. Gribbin, Director

University of Utah Library
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Brigham D. Madsen, Director

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Librarian

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
G. Donald Smith, Director

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Andrew J. Eaton, Director

Wayne State University Library
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Acting Director

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Franklyn Bright, Acting Director

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian

Association of Research Libraries.
Minutes of the meeting. 1st–
Dec. 1932–
[Princeton, N. J., etc.]

v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th–10th, 12th called respectively: 10th–11th, 13th.
INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st–42d, Dec. 1932–Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59–30046

Library of Congress [3]

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.